THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION

Volume VIII APRIL, 1922 Number 2

WHAT TEACHERS OF SPEECH MAY LEARN FROM THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF THE GREEKS*

PAUL SHOREY
University of Chicago

IT is not easy to speak on any topic of classical antiquity in these days without wasting time on what should be superfluous apologies. The new education has prepared a class of readers for Wells' Outline of History who are ready to swallow blindly his pronouncement that the literature of Rome counts for nothing in our culture and the literature of Greece for much less than it is the interest of the pedants who teach it to claim. I shall take it for granted that this audience does not require a warning against this poisoning of the wells of history and that, though most of you may be too busy to give much time to the study of the classics you all have a notion of the right perspective and truth of the matter, which is quite simple. The ancients did not have the science and the scientific industrialism which the modern world has developed in the past hundred and fifty years. They did have, through a continuous civilization of a thousand years, a literature, a literary culture and an education the equal of our own. This culture, apart from its intrinsic beauty, is historically the chief source of ours. These elementary truisms suffice to make the Greek and Roman classics, whether in the original or in translation, and in spite of all temporary ebbs and flow of fashion far more significant for any genuinely liberal modern education than ever can be the prehistoric anthropologies, the psychologies, and the sociologies which students, recalcitrant to the labor of mastering either science or classics, prefer to substitute for them.

*Read at the Convention of the National Association of Teachers of Speech, 1921.

The quickest way to convert a sceptic about the civilization of the Greeks is to bring him face to face with Greek architecture and sculpture. These speak a universal language. But the material of the subject on which you have asked me to speak is perhaps next in effectiveness and universality of appeal to the sincere student. The theory of the ancient rhetoricians and "teachers of speech" could with the aid of a very few technical terms be adequately reproduced in English, provided it were translated and summarized by really competent interpreters. Even as it is, a patient reader can learn a great deal from the "education of the orator" of the judicious Quintilian, which John Stuart Mill often commended as a compendium of the experience and good sense of the ancient world in this matter. If you do not shy and start away at the first diversity of ancient life that strikes you as quaint or odd, but read patiently on, you will find that there are few modern text-books so good and so full of meat. The corpus of Greek rhetoricians published in the nine volumes of Walz and less fully in the three volumes of the Teubner text has never been translated as a whole and the terminological refinements of Hermogenes on "ideas" and the scholiasts on Hermogenes, and the technicalities of the series of nonentities and anonymities who composed arts of rhetoric, Progymnasmata and treatises on figures, would hardly repay the labor of a translation, which would be a *tour de force*. The Loeb series will probably give us the excellent criticisms of the Greek orators and historians by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and it would be well if it also included the so-called rhetoric to Alexander which, if not, as Jebb pronounces it, the best practical treatise on rhetoric which has come down to us, is at any rate needed for the full understanding of the relation between the philosophic rhetoric of Aristotle and the environment in which it took shape. Meanwhile the best of the Greek doctrine is already available to the English reader in Sandys' edition of Jebb's almost infallible translation of Aristotle's Rhetoric and in Roberts' useful editions, with translation, of Demetrius on Style, Longinus on the Sublime, and the Three Literary Letters of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. These translations and the specimens of Hermogenes and other late writers in Jebb's Attic Orators illustrate the difficulty and yet the possibility of a practically sufficient rendering of the language of the Greek rhetoricians. The difficulty lies in the fact that the Greek vocabulary of rhetoric and literary

criticism is richer and more discriminating not only than the English but than the French and English combined and that it is not yet correctly recorded in any lexicon.* Yet the successes of Jebb and Roberts when at their best prove that it is entirely possible for a scholar who fully understands the originals to translate or paraphrase them, with transliteration perhaps of a few of the technical terms in such wise that the English reader would lose little.

That is, of course, not quite true of the masterpieces of ancient oratory. But it is more nearly true, I think, than it is of the other two chief divisions of classical literature, poetry and philosophy. A modern reader may enjoy the story of the Odyssey, the tragic poignancy of the Agamemnon, but he loses what Germany will never know that she misses in Shakespeare, the poetry. There is, and probably can be, no translation that makes it safe for the English-reading professor of philosophy to debate nice points in the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle. But though oratory, too, loses something in translation, it need not lose so much. There are probably no entirely adequate translations of Demosthenes and Cicero. But for a skilful translator, who had the courage to aim at equivalents rather than school-boy literalness, there would be no inherent and insuperable obstacle to the reproduction of almost any effect of ancient oratory without misrepresentation of the thought. If I had half an hour to spare, I would engage myself with all the defects of elocution that would be painfully apparent to your expert ears to translate to you from the open text passages from Demosthenes *On the Crown*, or the speeches in Livy that would make you directly feel, and not merely perfunctorily acknowledge, the equivalence of the mature ancient oratory to the best in that kind of the modern world.

We estimated the life of the ancient culture at a thousand years. I could for our present purpose plausibly add five hundred years to that estimate and appeal to Homer. The Homeric poems describe different styles of oratory, and show a conscious interest in the subject. Gladstone once said that Achilles' reply to Agamemnon's envoys in the ninth book of the Iliad was the greatest speech in the

*Cf. Ernesti, Lexicon Technologiae; Prof. La Rue Van Hook's Chicago dissertation, "The Metaphorical Terminology of Greek Rhetoric and Literary Criticism," and the glossaries in Roberts' Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Demetrius, and Longinus.

world. A witty popular lecturer amuses himself by assuring his audience that Homer's literary art must be and is as childish and immature a thing as is his science of medicine. Who shall adjudicate? With ten minutes to spare I would undertake, the bare text of Homer in hand, to convince nine-tenths of you that Professor Leacock's statement was an outrageous absurdity and Gladstone's, at the worst, a pardonable exaggeration.

But Homer tells us nothing of the education of Achilles except that he learned the healing art from the centaur, whom Pope styles, "sage Cheiron, sire of pharmacy." The continuous history of ancient rhetoric and oratory began with the Attic orators nearly five hundred years after Homer. Democracy, the ancients said, gave birth to oratory in the revolutions of Sicily and Athens. Men studied the art of speech because their lives and their fortunes depended on it, in the popular assemblies and the popular courts. And the new professors of the art of speech, often identical with the so-called Sophists, met a deeply-felt need and were the objects of a cult by ambitious and enthusiastic youth which is satirically depicted in Plato's Protagoras and Gorgias. I pass over the anecdotes, which you have doubtless read in Jebb's Attic Orators, by far the best book on the subject, though Blass' ponderous Attische Beredsamkeit retains its value for specialists and J. F. Dobson, The Greek Orators, London, 1919, is a readable resumé for the hurried reader.* This Attic oratory covers about a hundred years, from the speeches of Pericles and Cleon and Hermocrates reported by Thucydides[1] in a tortured style of his own, which no orator ever used and no audience ever could have understood, to the finished eloquence of Demosthenes. And from this Attic oratory and from the later Greek criticism and study of it, and its Roman imitation by Cicero, all the artistic oratory and nearly all the philosophy of rhetoric and prose style of the European world are ultimately derived.

What was it like? Even the roughest answer to that question requires us to distinguish between kinds and periods. The Greek

*Useful also are the sketches in Sandys' introduction to Cicero's Brutus and Wilkins' De Oratore, vol. i., and Cope's elaborate introduction to his edition of Aristotle's Rhetoric.

[1] Cf. "The Speeches of Thucydides" in Jebb's "Essays and Studies" and Shorey in Trans. Amer. Phil. Assn., 1893, pp. 66–88.

rhetors, like Webster, according to Rufus Choate's eulogy, thought different styles appropriate in the court room, before a deliberative political assembly, and in a Fourth of July or epideictic oration. The real Greek oratory is the mature and flexible oratory of Demosthenes and his contemporaries. The early orators interest mainly the student of the evolution of prose style. Some of them, in their first strivings towards mastery of expression, were quaintly stiff and formal, as Antiphon. Others, under the influence of the Sicilian rhetoric, experimented with the florid, antithetic, jingling style of sophomoric ornament, which they called the Gorgian figures, which has at other times been variously known as, *stile culto,* gongorism, or euphuism, and which Miss Amy Lowell dignifies by the name of polyphonic prose, and innocently imagines to be original with herself or her French models. The good sense of the ancients soon laughed polyphonic prose out of court, literally out of court. For Lysias, the model of Attic purity and simplicity, never employs it in his forensic orations, though he toys with it frequently in his perhaps spurious funeral or Fourth of July oration. Plato uses it, half in earnest, half in jest, somewhat in the manner of Ruskin, in his *Menexenus* and in passages of elaborate description or heightened feeling. But parody is never far off, and in the speech of Agathon in the Symposium [197 C] he lets himself go, out-Heroding Herod, outgorgonizing Gorgias, outamying Amy to this result:

"Love brings: to mortals peace, to wind-vexed ocean calm, and to the tired couch sweet slumber's balm. He alienates hostility and conciliates civility bringing us together in such reunions as this, in festivals, dances, and sacrifices, leader and guide. To mildness impelling all wildness repelling, donor of kindness, disowner of unkindness, gracious to the good beheld by the wise, admired by the gods, desired by the hapless and acquired by the happy, of wantonness, daintiness, luxury, grace, desire, and yearning the sire, regardful of the good, regardless of bad, in labor, in terror, in yearning, in learning, guide, consoler, supporter and saviour best, of all gods and men the glory, the leader fairest and rarest whom every man should follow fairly fair hymns reciting wherein delighting he casts his spell on the hearts of gods and men alike."

Demosthenes never made obtrusive use of this florid ornamentation. And all the sober critics of later antiquity deprecated its abuse, and restricted its use within the narrowest limits. Neverthe-

less florid ornament is an instinct of human nature on a certain level of culture. And during the eight hundred years after Demosthenes it was often revived from the so-called Asian rhetoric, which Cicero contrasts with the soberer teaching of the Rhodian school, to the conceits of the Latin declaimers reported in the entertaining book of the elder Seneca, the extravagances of the radical wing of the so-called new Sophistic, or Greek revival under the Roman empire, and the elaborate ingenuities of the style of Apuleius, which Walter Pater makes the text of an apology for his own style in Marius the Epicurean.

The text-books of later antiquity that transmitted the classical heritage of the Middle Ages were largely composed in one or more of these florid, jingling, antithetic, euphuistic, and mannered styles. And the Renaissance combined this tradition of the Middle Ages in fine writing with its own renewed study of the theory of Greek rhetoric, and the practise of the Gorgian figures in Isocrates in the style which in England took the name of Euphuism, and which is parodied in Shakespeare's Love's Labor Lost.

The history which I have thus sketched is detailed in Norden's chaotic but instructive book, *die Antike Kunstprosa*. Norden traces the origins of the flamboyant style back to philosophers and poets who preceded the Silician rhetors, and, as is the way of philologers when they exaggerate a thesis, he assumes that all modern euphuisms are directly traceable to these sources, whereas they are often, of course, merely the expression of the sophomoric taste of the natural man. Even at the height of the fashion of Euphuism sensible Renaissance critics judged it as the more rational critics of antiquity had done. Our histories do further injustice to some of the practitioners of Euphuism in the older English literature by failing to recognize the strict limits within which most of them confined it. They adopted the distinction of the ancients that polyphonic prose, though unsuitable for business uses, was appropriate for set-pieces, epideictic displays, and compliments. Very sober writers, otherwise, employ it in complimentary dedications of their books to King James or other noble patrons; and to quote these specimens, as is usually done, without noting this distinction is to convey a false impression of their prevailing good sense.

Having followed this historical digression to its conclusion, we return to our question, What is Greek oratory, the real Greek oratory

of Demosthenes, like? De Quincey says that Greek oratory is emotional, illogical, irrelevant to a degree that a modern jury or deliberative assembly would not tolerate. But De Quincey loved a paradox; the statement is the reverse of the truth. Greek lawyers and politicians were no more scrupulous than others of their kind, in the means they used to carry their point. But Greek oratory, and Demosthenes in particular, is more, not less, rational and consequently argumentative than the oratory of the modern world. The first impression made by Demosthenes on the untrained modern reader is disappointment at the absence of eloquence. He does not satisfy the expectation of readers habituated to the exuberant rhetoric of the Ciceronian tradition that descends through Burke and Webster. There is nothing in Demosthenes remotely resembling Prentiss' "He who taught the eagle of our country, while yet unfledged, to plume his young wing and mate his talons with the lion's strength"; or the peroration of Webster's reply to Hayne; or Ingersoll's "plumed knight"; or Garfield's "the coming fight is our Thermopylae"; or Proctor Knott's "zenith city of the unsalted seas"; or Bryan's "cross of gold"; or Roosevelt's "we stand at Armageddon." Charles Sumner was our scholar in politics, yet there is no better example of what Demosthenes was not than the overloaded outburst in his Kansas-Nebraska speech:

> "It has already drawn to its bosom a population of freemen larger than Athens crowded within her historic gates when her sons under Miltiades won liberty for mankind on the field of Marathon; more than Sparta contained when she ruled Greece and sent forth her devoted children, quickened by a mother's benediction, to return with their shields or on them; more than Rome gathered on her seven hills when under her kings she commenced that sovreign sway which afterward embraced the whole earth; more than London held when on the fields of Cressy and Agincourt the English banner was carried victoriously over the chivalrous hosts of France."

That is not unlike the style of some of the later and more degenerate Greek rhetoricians. Sumner read Greek, but he had not mastered the first principles of Greek art, *meden agan*.

And strangely enough the best illustration I could give you of what Demosthenes *is* like would be Lincoln, who knew no Greek, but who was educated, not by electives in sociology and anthropology, but on Shakespeare and Blackstone, Euclid, the Bible and the constitution of the United States. I would not overstrain the

parallel. Lincoln of course produced no such body of finished oratory as has come down to us from Demosthenes. He never underwent Demosthenes' long and severe discipline in the art of rhetoric and the practise of speaking. But he is far more like Demosthenes than is Charles Sumner or any other American orator whom I could name. He is free alike from the old-fashioned florid southern oratory and from the quaint mixture of Bowery slang and sophomoric declamation that too often passes for eloquence in Congress today. He does not strain after epigram and conceit, indulge in cheap classical allusions or mix his metaphors. His Gettysburg speech shows, I think, that he had read Pericles' funeral oration in Thucydides. It may be that he had looked through a translation of Demosthenes, for he must have associated with many statesmen, who, like Mr. Bryan, had read Demosthenes *On the Crown* at college and didn't care who knew it. At any rate he affords the best modern illustration of the prevailing seriousness of the Demosthenic logic, suffused with, but not overmastered by emotion. He has the Demosthenic power of crowding an opponent into a corner, forcing him to a definite issue by a swift succession of inevitable and unanswerable questions. And he resembles Demosthenes also in the incomparable effectiveness of the sudden flashes of passionate eloquence introduced at just the apt place, and confined to the right measure. There have been many vain attempts to translate Demosthenes' oath taken by those who fell at Marathon, belauded by critics from Longinus *On the Sublime* to the present day. But there is perhaps no better way to realize its effect than to reread the much simpler and slighter, but similar surprise that thrilled the audience to thunderous applause in Lincoln's Kansas-Nebraska speech: the battle of freedom, he said, "is to be fought out on principle. Slavery is a violation of the eternal right. We have temporized with it from the necessities of our conditions. *But as sure as God reigns and school-children read,* that black, foul lie can never be consecrated into God's hallowed truth." Rufus Choate, apologizing for the scream of the American eagle, says that higher laws than those of taste determine the consciousness of nations: "There is an eloquence of an expiring nation, such as seems to sadden the glorious speech of Demosthenes . . . . . and there is an eloquence of a state beginning to ascend to the first class of power . . . and conscious of itself. It is to no purpose that they tell you it is bad taste."

These words were spoken in 1853 before Lincoln became prominent. The resemblance of Lincoln's logic to Demosthenes' may be partly due to his practise in debate and partly to the fact that, like Demosthenes, he lived in and for and with one great patriotic idea, which he mastered in all its details and applications. The miracle of Lincoln's Greek sense of measure and his self-emancipation from the florid taste for which Choate half-apologizes in himself and Webster I cannot explain. We may say it was his genius, and we may fancy that it was the saddening and sobering effect of the fratricidal conflict, whose imminence haunted his dreams.

But we must not press this analogy to the point of forgetting that Demosthenes was what Lincoln was not, the inheritor of an elaborate culture, the severely-trained and conscious master of all the arts of speech and rhetoric. He is too great an artist to display his art obtrusively. The unsophisticated reader feels it only in the secure frame work of the logic, the lucid disposition of the whole, the relief of argument by narration and of both by touches of eloquence, denunciation, and if not humor an *ēthos* that had the effect of humor, in the union of dignity, vigor, naturalness, and purity in the vocabulary, the escape from monotony by apt variation of phrases, by rhetorical question, irony, apostrophe, figures of speech, figures of thought and tropes, the rhythms, carefully calculated not to irritate the ear by harshness, or tease it by long successions of short syllables, or disgust it by too soft and facile and obviously poetical cadences.

All these things and the qualities, good and bad, of Lysias, Isocrates, and the other Attic orators, were analyzed, classified, and technically named by the contemporaries of Demosthenes and still more by those later Greek schools of rhetoric which taught, imitated, and commented on his orations for seven hundred years. This, together with the philosophic rhetoric that began with Plato, which was carried on by Aristotle and the Stoics,[1] and was more or less blended with the other in the writings of Cicero and Quintilian, constitutes a huge body of rhetorical theory and literary criticism which it would be useless for me to attempt to summarize here. It is still being actively and critically studied by philological specialists in Germany and America.[2] The main outlines of the doctrine are summed up in Volkmann's *Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer* and for style more especially in Gerber's *Die Sprache als Kunst.*

Much of it, like much in modern handbooks of rhetoric, is trivial and hair-splitting, multiplying terminology for terminology's sake. And some of the treatises collected in Walz are only less silly than medieval scholasticism or twentieth century educational psychology. But there is hardly an idea or distinction of modern rhetoric and literary criticism of prose style that cannot be found somewhere in the mass.

For seven centuries all educated ancients knew something of this body of doctrine, and many had made a special study of it. Most educated men at the Renaissance knew something of it, either at first hand, or from translations and paraphrases in the vernacular. Today it is forgotten by all but specialists. Yet if we are to study and analyze oratorical expression and prose style at all, there is much both in its substance and its terminology that would save us from intellectual confusion and futile logomachy.*

It is easy to ridicule the subtlety which having made necessary distinctions goes on to make unnecessary ones. A notable passage of Plato's Phaedrus (266–67) set the fashion of this satire and reads almost like a prophecy of the prodiorthosis, epidiorthosis, amphidiorthosis, the epanalepsis, anadiplosis, and epanaphora, the pareklasis and the paradiegesis of the later rhetoricians. But all the terms which the Greek language so readily coins have some meaning, and many become indispensable categories of the thought, permanent additions to the vocabulary of anyone who has once learned their application. Thesis and hypothesis, ēthos and pathos, peribole, ongkos, emphasis in its true meaning, kakozelia, the "fond affection" of Puttenham, deinótes, gorgótes, semnótes and the rest. The higher culture of the Renaissance, as I have said, retained this doctrine in memory for a century. Now it is as completely forgotten as the logic of the schoolmen. We can dispense perhaps with the distinction between aition, synechon, and krinomenon or that between a

[1]Striller de Stoicorum Studiis Rhetoricis.

[2]Cf. Shorey, "Classical Studies in America," Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc., vol. 50, pp. 48 and 54. The Drerup series there mentioned now includes nine studies.

*Saintsbury, History of Criticism, I, 87–108, gives a general notion of the matter in readable form. But he cannot be trusted in details or in the translation of rhetorical terminology. E.g.; the specimen passage from Hermogenes on p. 100 is completely misunderstood, though it is fairly well explained in Volkmann, p. 259. Cf. also Saintsbury, p. 25 with Shorey, Physis, Melete, Episteme, Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc., vol. 40, p. 185.

hyperthetic and a parenthetic hyperbaton or an epanaphoric and an antistrophic comma. We can be content not to discriminate diegesis and aphegesis, epicheireme and enthymeme, energeia and enargeia. We need not blush if we cannot define an epembolic hypostrophe or decide offhand whether Demosthenes' apostrophe to Aeschines is to be classified as an example of "method" or "schema." But some tincture of this learning is still needed for the intelligence of our own literature. A letter of Tennyson shows him composing his earlier poems with a view to effects which he describes in the terminology of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. And though an eminent scholar speaks of Shakespeare's presumed "ignorance of all the figures catalogued by Puttenham", the fact is that Shakespeare had evidently studied them in some Elizabethan handbook and consciously endeavored to realize their suggestions in his own writing. To take the most obvious example, I wonder what proportion of those engaged in teaching literature today are quite clear in their minds about the difference between the ancient and the present-day use of the expression, "figures of speech," or could sharply distinguish a figure of speech from a figure of thought and from a trope. Yet Shakespeare who had small Latin and less Greek, knew. When Polonius says, " 'Tis true 'tis pity, and pity 'tis 'tis true, a foolish figure but farewell it, for I will use no art," he employs figure in the correct ancient sense. And when Hamlet says, "the Mouse-trap. Marry, how Tropically," he is aware of the difference between a figure of speech and a trope. Even so widely-read a critic as Mr. Gosse apparently is not. He calls Sir Thomas Browne's "tropically" "one of his odd turns of phrase" with no hint that to Browne it wasn't odd at all—but elementary education.

After the Attic orators the next and only other age of real political oratory was the century of Cicero. But through the seven or eight hundred years remaining of ancient civilization the oratory of the courtroom and the declamation of the schools were assiduously practised. And there are always opportunties in every civilization for the epideictic oratory of compliment and display and the due celebration of functions and occasions.* Throughout these centuries the higher education, the high-school and college education so to speak, of the Greek or Roman gentleman, centered in the study

*Cf. Dr. Theodore C. Burgess, Epideictic Literature, University of Chicago Studies in Classical Philology, vol. III.

either of rhetoric or of philosophy, or, more rarely, of both in combination. The link between these two competing systems of education was the treatment of the theory of rhetoric by the philosophers. This began with Plato, or with the sophists whom Plato satirized. Plato's dialogues on rhetoric, the Gorgias and the Phaedrus, either as wholes or in extracts, were always read or lectured on in the rhetorical as well as in the philosophical schools. Cicero, for example, read them with his professors at Athens, [De Or. I. 11] and their influence is to be felt in nearly everything he wrote. Quintilian [II. 15, 24] complained that those who hastily read only a few extracts did injustice to Plato. History repeats itself in our schools of education today. The Gorgias is a bitter assault upon the rhetoric of the politician, the lawyer, and the professional teacher, from the point of view of the absolute, philosophical, and ethical ideal. Gorgias accepts the definition of rhetoric as the art of persuasion and pleads that it is no more reasonable to blame its teachers for the occasional misuse of this faculty than it would be to complain of the teachers of boxing becauses an unruly boy had boxed his father's ears. Socrates denies that rhetoric is an art or science at all. It is only a trick of flattery, like Sicilian cooking, or the imitation of the hues of health and exercise by lip-stick and rouge. The persuasion that it effects, is opinion, not knowledge. It is taught and practised at Athens, not as an indispensable means of the social control of the multitude, for their own good, but as an instrument of selfish profit, and of advancement in the courtroom and the assembly.

The questions thus started were debated throughout antiquity and are still, under other forms, discussed today. I myself can hardly resist the temptation to digress and preach from the text that our own teaching of rhetoric is too much concerned with the success of the speaker and too little with the edification of the audience. It is more interested in the "psychology" of "putting it over" and "getting it across" than in the training of the habits of logical analysis and suspense of judgment that would enable an audience to resist such hypnotization. Yet the greatest service which high school and college education could render to America today would be, not to multiply the number of fluent, plausible, and self-confident speakers, but to create in every audience a resisting minority that cannot be stampeded by plausible sophistry and emo-

tional volubility. But that would be a digression, and I have no moral authority to enforce my preaching, so I return to history.

The practical sense of Aristotle, disregarding Platonic idealism, accepted Gorgias' plea that the abuse of rhetoric does not discredit the use. He added the consideration nobly developed in Milton's Areopagitica and still used to justify partisan advocacy in the court-room, that truth and right are inherently stronger than wrong, and will, in the end, gain more by the development of the arts of persuasion. The quibble that a science or art must achieve its end and that the orator does not always, in fact, persuade, he met by the distinction that the end of rhetoric is not to persuade, which may be impossible in a given case, but to speak persuasively. Quintilian, four hundred years later, discussing the various definitions of rhetoric, has a sentence which would be enigmatic without reference to this distinction. He says, eliptically and cryptically, "some have abstracted from the outcome." That is my translation of 2. 15. 2: *quidam recesserunt ab eventu.* I had the curiosity to look the passage up in the new Loeb translation by Professor Butler. It is there rendered: "some on the other hand pay no attention to results."

The specific question started in Plato's Gorgias, whether rhetoric is an art or a trick, was discussed with an excess of ingenuity in the later Peripatetic and Epicurean schools. Echoes of these debates have also come down to us through an Epicurean essay, fragments of which have been rescued from the charred rolls of Herculaneum, and somewhat conjecturally translated, or paraphrased by Dr. H. M. Hubbell of Yale in the Transactions of the Connecticut Academy for September, 1920. The Epicurean view seems to have been that the study of ornamental and epideictic style may be in a sense an art, but that there is no rhetorical science of political persuasion for the government and good of mankind.

Plato's Phaedrus will seem to the hasty reader an incongruous confusion of the two themes, Platonic Love and rhetoric. We cannot delay for that. The discussion of rhetoric and the theory of style are associated with the critical comparison of two sample speeches of Lysias and Socrates on Platonic Love. Very amusing and not without a significance for today is Plato's satire of the tautologies and the superfluous terminologies of contemporary rhetoric. But he himself, somewhat scornfully, outlines a program for a rhetoric of the future which if based on psychology and dialectic might be an

art or science. Such a rhetoric would analyze and classify ideas, on the one hand, and types of mind and temperament on the other. It would then proceed; such and such a mind is accessible to, and easily persuaded by such and such arguments for such and such reasons. That would be the teachable theory and science of rhetoric. But practical success as an orator requires in addition natural gifts and long practise.* The acquisition and mastery of a style is no light task. It is hardly worth while to undertake that labour to curry favor with your fellow-slaves, but only to please the gods. In other words, the higher function of the art of speech is to write philosophic masterpieces, not to convince Athenian juries. The greatest masters of all the arts of style have often affected this disdain for their cunning. Plato says that no elaborate prose style can dispense with an element of jest and unreality. Renan speaks of his own talent as almost a sin before the altar of the higher intellect. And Ruskin alludes with playful disparagement to his youthful knack of putting his words together prettily.

Though Aristotle rarely neglects an opportunity to contradict his old teacher, he evidently wrote with a card-catalogue of Plato's notable passages on his desk. The main body of the Rhetoric, the first two books, is a working out of Plato's idea that if rhetoric is to be more than a rule of thumb it must be a combination of logic and ethical psychology. The book is accessible in many translations, and Jebb's summary of it in the article "Rhetoric" in the Encyclopædia Britannica is better than any that there is time for here. All the rhetorics that stress chiefly the logic of persuasion are derived from this. Much of what Aristotle has to say runs parallel to one of his neglected, but most significant, logical works, the *Topics*. Topic for us, means a subject, a theme. It also means for us, as it did for Cicero, and the later Greeks and Romans, a commonplace, which an orator may prepare and use as needed, a declamation against luxury or profiteers or rolled stockings.

But for Aristotle it further meant a typical form or method of argument. It is not really, as some of the ancients already said, any more possible to classify arguments exhaustively and definitively than it is figures or tropes or etymologies or jokes or associations of ideas, or dreams, or a university library by the Dewey system. But

*Cf. Shorey, Phusis, Melete and Episteme.

the Aristotelian and Spencerian type of mind will always be tempted to try. Observing for twenty or thirty years the philosophic, the forensic, the political debates of fourth-century Athens, Aristotle could not be happy till he had reduced this immense chaotic experience to order, and found a fit pigeon-hole and label for every type of argument and oratorical device that he had collected in his *zettel*. He did not of course succeed. Even to understand his classification requires close attention and some historical knowledge of Athenian life and politics.* And after the system is understood, every ingenious thinker will be ready with a better classification of his own. Nevertheless, it is the most original and stimulating part of the Rhetoric. It made a great impression on Cicero, who never quite understood it, but relished the idea of a provision of commonplaces and a bundle of tricks which would never leave an orator in the lurch. Cicero's own work, entitled *Topica*, is a very superficial and inaccurate sketch, scribbled, so at least he affirms, from memory and far from books, at the solicitation of a friend.

The third book of Aristotle's Rhetoric, by hypercriticism thought spurious[1] deals with what is most prominent in modern rhetoric, style (diction, and delivery), vocabulary, metaphor, and other ornaments, false taste, rhythm, the adaptation of style to the three kinds of oratory, forensic, deliberative and epideictic, the ordering of the parts or subdivisions of a discourse or speech and the tone appropriate to each, and similar themes. The *Poetics* goes over some of the same ground from the point of view of poetry. From the two derive all European theories and criticisms of style. The history of the *Poetics* does not concern us, further than to fix its relation to the oratorical tradition. The Roman empire, like the British, educated its future rulers, not in the college of commerce and politics, but by the reading of old poetry and the practise of new verse composition. Mr. H. G. Wells would say that that was the reason why the Roman and the British empires were such egregious failures. At any rate that was in fact their education. But in the Roman scheme the poetry was preparatory and subordinate to the study and practise of oratory. They, if I may so

*On the meaning of "topic" cf. Grote's Aristotle, vol. I. and Jebb's translation of the Rhetoric, pp. 12 and 142.

[1]Cf. however, Hendrickson, in A. J. P. xxvi, 251.

express it, reversing our practice, put Virgil in the third year of the high school and Cicero in the fourth. The object of the poetry was to develop the linguistic sense, impart general culture, quicken the imagination, and especially to enlarge the vocabulary. When that was accomplished, the professor of classics turned the boy over to the more serious ministrations of the professors of speech. The consequence of this was, that the literary criticism of antiquity is predominantly the criticism of prose, and especially of oratorical style. Not exclusively of course. Aristotle's *Poetics,* Horace's *Arts Poetica,* and Longinus' *On the Sublime* represent another line of criticism well worth studying. But Cicero and Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Quintilian, Hermogenes and the great mass of the Greek rhetoricians, considered style chiefly from the standpoint of oratory, and Quintilian's survey of the history of literature (Book x) estimates poets by their contribution to the formation of the taste, the logic, and the vocabulary of the orator.

To return a moment to the Rhetoric of Aristotle as a whole, it of course had other sources than Aristotle's card-catalogue of Plato. The fourth century successors of the Sophists developed a considerable literature of rhetoric, the results of which Aristotle, before composing his own Rhetoric, characteristically collected or had his students collect in a compilation called the *Synagoge of the Arts* (arts of rhetoric, that is). The work is lost, but its fragments have been collected by industrious Germans.* Aristotle also, as the numerous quotations and anecdotes in his Rhetoric show, drew much from his observation of the actual practise of the Athens of his day.[1] The chief influence here, beside Plato, was Isocrates, who for fifty years conducted a rival school to the Platonic Academy and the Aristotelian Lyceum. Isocrates after a few experiments in youth, did not speak in public himself, but composed in the form of ora-

*Cf. especially Spengel's "Artium Scriptores," a repertory of texts and anecdotes exploited by all later writers. Navarre's La Rhetorique Grecque avant Aristote, Paris, 1900, is readable.

[1]He set the fashion of illustrating the principles of rhetoric by quotation from the literature. This constitutes a large part of the charm of Longinus and lends a kind of interest to the silliest treatises of the most degenerate of the later rhetoricians. The rhetorics of Apsines and Hermogenes are almost analytic commentaries on the orations of Demosthenes. The "Rhetoric to Alexander" and the so-called "Auctor ad Herennium" (in Cicero's works) represent the opposite practice, the uses of examples invented by the writer.

tions, treatises and pamphlets on problems of the day, political, social and educational. He read these essays or had them read to his pupils, and encouraged them to discuss, analyze, criticize, and imitate these performances. He maintained that this was a better and more practical education than the "mental discipline" which the dialectics, the metaphysics, the mathematics and the astronomy of the rival school supplied. Isocrates was also what we call a "stylist." In epideictic pieces he made a moderate but unmistakable use of the Gorgian figures, the antitheses, the balancings and the jingles of polyphonic prose.* And this was perhaps the most conspicuous feature of his influence on certain minds, and at certain periods. But his own mature judgment would have attached more importance to his care in the choice and discrimination of vocabulary, the flow and harmony of the rhythm, the avoidance of hiatus, of harsh combinations of consonants, and the inelegant repetition of the same syllable in such collocations as "an antagonist," or "in ineptitude." He is, through Cicero and Burke, the chief source of the smooth, rounded, grammatically impeccable, unelliptical long sentence in periodic style which the present generation finds so intolerably pompous, hollow, and monotonous. Isocrates was much relished also as a moralist by the scholars of the Renaissance.* The recent revival of interest in him is, I must be permitted to say, since it is true, in part German and radical propaganda. The radicals like to oppose him to what they fancy was the metaphysics of the absolute and the dogmatism of preaching in Plato. The Germans and their accomplices or dupes in England and America set the fashion of using his flattery of King Philip to disparage the futile patriotism of Demothenes, whose eloquence only fostered the illusion that an undisciplined democracy could resist the mighty Beamtenstaat of the North. This idea is now being widely inculcated in America by Mr. H. G. Wells and in textbooks of Greek History, manufactured by professors who, like the present speaker, hold a German degree and unlike him, were made or remade in Germany. Professor Goodwin's edition of the oration *On the Crown* is the indicated antidote. And so long as that kind of

*Cf. the Chicago dissertation of John E. Hollingsworth on "Antithesis in the Attic Orators."

*Cf. Shorey, article "Isocrates" in Hasting's Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics.

propaganda continues, I acknowledge no impropriety in answering it and exposing it whenever an audience grants me a hearing.

The two and a half centuries that followed the death of Demosthenes and Aristotle witnessed the extinction of genuine political oratory, the expansion of the schools of rhetoric and the declamation of the schools both as an end in itself and as a preparation for the bar,—and lastly the elaboration of the technique and terminology of what became the common body of Graeco-Roman rhetoric.

True political eloquence is the child of liberty, as the history of British, American, French, and German oratory would suffice to show. It can flourish only where the votes of parliaments and people determine the destinies of states. After the death of Cicero Greek and Roman critics both recognized this truth, which the Greeks could not be expected clearly to forsee at the death of Demosthenes. Many besides Quintilian wrote treatises on the causes of the decline and corruption of eloquence and found the dominant cause in the loss of the old political freedom. Tacitus' *Dialogue on Orators* has an eloquent peroration on this theme. And there is a fine passage to the same effect in Longinus *On the Sublime*.

The declamation of the schools supplies the material of a facetious or ironical chapter in nearly all recent histories of Greek and Roman literature.* It could be made—I have sometimes myself made it—the theme of a more entertaining lecture than this. But I think that the summary I am attempting will be more profitable. The beginnings could easily be traced back to the Sophists who preceded Aristotle, and to that school of Isocrates, from which Cicero said as from the Trojan horse a line of princes of eloquence emerged. But later tradition attributed to Demetrius of Phalerum, who ruled Athens circ. 317–310 B. C. shortly after the death of Demosthenes, the institution of the practise of formal declamation on imaginary and scholastic themes. Another tradition told of the foundation of the rhetorical school of Rhodes by Aeschines who went into exile after his defeat by Demosthenes. His chief stock-in-trade and texts were his own oration *Against Ctesiphon* and Demosthenes' *On the Crown*. When his audience admired the latter, he said, "You should have heard the brute recite it himself." Whatever its origin the practise of declamation became a conspicuous feature of ancient

*Cf. Simcox Latin Lit. 1, VIII, p. 433ff, "The Declaimers," Sumner "Silver Age of Latin Literature," pp. 3–15.

education, culture, literature, and social life for 700 years. Cicero for many years declaimed daily in both Greek and Latin, and at the height of his youthful reputation visited Greece, Rhodes, and Asia Minor for several months' study in the schools; which is as if Webster after the reply to Hayne or Mr. Bryan after the *Cross of Gold* had taken up a course in the study of rhetoric at a German university.

One Latin and one Greek book are the two chief sources of modern facetiousness on the topic. The Latin book is the volume of the elder Seneca on Suasories and Controversies, from which Ben Johnson's *Discoveries* copies entire paragraphs without acknowledgement. A suasory was a speech advising Sulla to resign the dictatorship, or Hannibal to retire from the gates of Rome, or Wilson not to go to Paris. As an instrument of education it was not so silly as it sounds. For to write a good suasory you had to get up all the circumstances and think yourself into the life and character of your personage. A controversy was a debate for and against some proposition of ethical casuistry or real or fancied law embodied in an imaginary case. The writing and declaiming of suasories and controversies was the crown and consummation of the education in rhetoric which began with the reading of the poets and the writing of innumerable daily themes in the forms of fables, narrations, descriptions, moral anecdotes and other exercises, many text-books of which have come down to us under the title of Progymnasmata, or propædeutic exercitations.* In the school the students declaimed to one another and to the teacher, whom the satirist Juvenal commiserates when he must listen to a numerous class as it slays the bloody tyrant. The teacher also declaimed specimens of his own eloquence to the class, who were expected to applaud. There were open days on which fond parents could attend to hear young hopeful declaim. There were public exhibitions to which the orator invited his friends as the new poets did to their recitations. In short the pursuit of amateur literature by culture-chasers under the Roman Empire anticipated and surpassed the achievements of our old-fashioned American women's clubs before social service and the ballot diverted them from the idea of nemesis in Greek tragedy to the league of nations and the milk supply of Kalamazoo. The

*Saintsbury, History of Criticism, vol. 1, p. 89ff, is fairly full on these.

Greek side of the movement is known to us from Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists* nearly 200 years later than Seneca's book. The Sophists mean now, not the old targets of Socratic irony, but the so-called "new" Sophists, or teachers of rhetoric, itinerant lecturers and practitioners of *ex tempore* declamation in all the foremost cities of the Roman empire, from Asia Minor to the Scottish wall. Philostratus recounts the lives of a large number of these gentry, relates many anecdotes about them, and gives brief specimens of their eloquence, their conceits, and their "epigrams."

The relative advantage of *ex tempore* and prepared speaking were debated in antiquity as they are today. There is an amazingly modern essay on the subject by one Alcidamas, a contemporary of Isocrates and Plato. The more sober ancients recognized the fact which sentimentalism and vanity vainly try to hide, that nearly all the best oratory of the world has been written and memorized. They esteem memorizing one of the most difficult and important divisions of the whole art of oratory, and their precepts and suggestions on the subject have left very little for the modern pseudo-science of psychology to add. One of the best, but by accident least-known, of all the doctoral dissertations which I have guided is the treatise of Miss Hazel Louise Brown, *Extemporary Speech in Antiquity,* which is full of information that some clever person will sometimes plagiarize with inpunity. It runs through the whole history of ancient oratory and collects the evidence that the ancients memorized their speeches, adding many illustrations in proof of the fact that this is also the actual, though concealed, practise of most modern orators. The genuinely *ex tempore* speaker is always liable to such accidents as befell ex-president Taft, as his lecture is reported in the Rice Institute Pamphlet (VII, 2, April, 1920, p. 77); "Just read," he cried, "how Queen Elizabeth lived; cold palaces, buggy-beds,—everything that we now regard as indispensable to the reasonable comforts and cleanliness of modern life!" In antiquity the artistic school naïvely admitted that the object of memorizing was to produce an illusion of improvisation. Quintilian laments that if the later arrival of a distinguished visitor constrains you to repeat a memorized declamation it is very difficult to lie. For you can hardly help repeating it in the same words. Philostratus tells the story of a professor who by calling on his friends in the audience would always procure the proposal to him of a theme for *ex*

tempore declamation on which he was already prepared. A malicious rival took his speech down by short hand and the next time he extemporized it read the manuscript in competition like a prompter. But though some virtuosos practised improvisation, and all strove for the appearance of it, the artistic school affected to disdain this crude volubility. No one, said Quintilian, can extort my admiration for mere fluency and a flux of words, a thing in which any two quarreling women superabound. The ancients perceived as clearly as we do the defects of an education based merely on this artificial rhetoric. They anticipated most modern satire of culture-chasing and amateur literature, and there is little that Shaw, Wells, Dewey, and their imitators can say in denunciation of the alleged divorce of the school from "life" that could not be matched in the fulminations of some classical critic. The reason why boys are made so stupid at school is that they learn nothing there that concerns real life, says Petronius Arbiter. The Ohio school superintendent who uses the word "life" forty-six times in seven pages in his first chapter would say amen to that.

Much of the ancient criticism is more special. It expresses the practical lawyer's distrust of the unreality of mind engendered by the practise of irresponsible declamation. The topics treated were often hair-splitting, casuistical, romantic, fanciful. And in the development of such questions Quintilian observes we always interpret in our own favor every point not explicitly against us in the statement of the case. Moreover, the declaimer seeking the applause of student or of a dilettante audience was tempted to substitute conceits, epigrams, or flights of fine writing for serious argument on the theme. Quintilian, Seneca, and Philostratus give examples of the so-called epigrams which would match the choicest specimens of twentieth century smartness. "Our up-to-date style," Quintilian caustically remarks, "does not really achieve many epigrams. But it gets everything off as if it were an epigram."

The unreality of the closet orator exhibited itself in other ways. He abused the figures of rhetoric he had learned at school, and soared into eloquence inopportunely. "Why," exclaimed one of these novices, apostrophizing his opponent in court, "Why are you turning the stern gaze of those truculent eyes upon me?" "Well, in fact I wasn't," interrupted his hard-boiled adversary; "but since you will have it so, here goes." And he made a horri-

ble face at the youth which convulsed the jury and spoiled the speech.

That kind of criticism requires only common sense. The poet Martial has an epigram on a young lawyer who would practise the Charles Sumner style of oratory in the municipal court.

'Tis not for murder, arson, or assault
I've brought this action, but three goats I own
Which now are missing by my neighbor's fault.
That is the thing the judge wants to be shown.
But you of Cannae and the furious
Wars waged with perjured Carthage and the name
Of dire Mithridates, Mucius,
Of Marius and Sulla, still declaim,
With fervent gestures and stentorian throat.
Now Postumus, say a word about my goat.

And yet with time I would be willing to maintain the thesis that despite the overweighting of the literary side, it was not a bad education. Generalized and qualified it remained the basis of French education until quite recently. It was not so good for many purposes as a severe discipline in mathematics and the real sciences, —not perhaps so good as a sound study of language and a critical interpretation of great literature. But it was more effective and a better education than that which now muddles the undergraduate mind under the elective system in the preposterous predominance of the pseudo-sciences psychological, sociological, prehistorical, and anthropological in all their multitudinous ramifications and pretended applications. However that may be, its significance for the history of culture can hardly be overestimated. To this is due the oratorical quality of Roman literature which De Quincey brings out so well in his essay on rhetoric. Livy is, as Taine's brilliant monograph shows, essentially an orator. There are good critics who enjoy the speeches in his history more than they do the orations of Cicero. Virgil is almost as much of an orator as a poet. Many of the finest passages of Juvenal's fierce satires are obvious motives of declamation borrowed from the schools. Ovid distinguished himself in the schools and two of the finest speeches in the world—the contention of Ajax and Odysseus for the arms of Achilles in his *Metamorphoses*—are really but familiar themes of the declaimers reproduced in hexameter verse.

But it is time to turn back and finish our historical survey. The third feature of the interval between Demosthenes and Cicero

was the development of the technical theory of rhetoric. As in the parallel case of the evolution of logic, there was not really much to add to the fundamental ideas of Plato and Aristotle. But the ingenuity of the later schools and especially of the Stoics elaborated and refined unweariedly in definitions, distinctions, classifications, terminology, and practical precepts, and in so doing hit upon many interesting minor ideas of education, psychology, the logic of debate, and the literary criticism of style. The detail of this is infinite and would swamp us here. The literature is lost, and we have to reconstruct the doctrine from Cicero's quotations and the Greek writers of the first four Christian centuries. While style and diction were not neglected, attention seems first to have been concentrated by the Stoics on the logic of forensic argument. In the decline of political eloquence the oratory of the court room absorbed their interest. A certain Hermagoras won great fame by his theory and classification of what was called the *status* or in Greek the *stasis* of a case or question. It has been the theme of many erudite German dissertations—some of them partly right, many of them largely wrong.* The best brief notion that I can give of it is that it closely resembles the logic of the old English doctrine of the determination of an issue by successive pleadings. It was an attempt to classify and name all possible sorts of debatable questions by the issue on which they turned, and like all would-be exhaustive categories it was foredoomed to failure. Quintilian handles it gingerly merely to show that he is not wholly ignorant, and dismisses it with disdain as mere Greek pedantry. There were similar attempts at exhaustive and final classification of all figures of speech, tropes, and ornaments of style. They are interesting enough for any one who has time to study them—which the editors of Liddell and Scott's Greek lexicon have obviously not done—but they are mentioned here only as a warning to all prospective authors of analyses of literature and new systems of reforming rhetorical and critical terminology. The Greeks have been there before.

For practical and cultural purposes the essence of it all is in Cicero's rhetorical works. Cicero has suffered in the estimate of the fastidious by his ambition to be the Roman Demosthenes and Plato, with neither of whom he or anybody else can sustain the com-

*Cf. Thiele, "Hermagoras."

parison. Too docile American pupils have sometimes followed his Prussian detractors in sneering at Cicero's unavailing opposition to the imperious autocratic genius of Cæsar. And, as we have already seen, the Ciceronean amplitude and flowery fluency of style are now out of fashion. None the less Cicero remains in Matthew Arnold's words the first man of letters of the ancient world, or to phrase it more ambitiously, he is the central figure in the history of European culture.* In addition to all his original achievements in oratory and statesmanship, it is he who mainly transmitted to the Middle Age, the Renascence, and the Eighteenth Century the knowledge of what constituted Graeco-Roman culture for 1000 years—the philosophy in his philosophical works, the rhetoric in his *De Oratore*, his *Brutus, or history of Roman oratory*, his *Orator, or ideal of the perfect orator*. They are not Platonic dialogues. There is no dramatic rendering of the cut and thrust of real debate. That would ruffle senatorial dignity, and the grave Romans left such logomachies to Greek levity. But when they retired from the wealth and the smoke of Rome and the roar of the insane forum to their luxurious villas overlooking the Campagna or the Bay of Naples, they discoursed, or Cicero loved to fancy that they did, in reminiscences of their studies at the university of Athens or of the lectures that they had dropped in to hear in the intervals of Eastern campaigns and diplomatic missions. It is a pretty if idealized picture of the culture of the Roman nobility, resembling that which Matthew Arnold sketches in his essay on translating Homer, of the culture of the eighteenth century nobility of England.

Cicero's senators, after an interchange of stately compliments and a few remarks on Roman and world politics, agree to discuss some large subject of their Greek studies. They will discuss it, not as Greeklings and Sophists, but as Romans, statesmen, lawyers, and men of the world. Each of the speakers is assigned a topic or aspect of the general subject, which he presents in what is probably Cicero's imitation of the best recent Greek book he had read, or lectures he had heard. But Cicero imitates freely, introduces much from his own reading of Plato and Aristotle, something perhaps of the conversation of Greek philosophers who had been inmates of his

*Cf. Zeilinski's Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte, and the readable summary of it by A. C. Clark in English Literature and the Classics; Oxford, 1912.

household, and adds his own reflections and many illustrations from Roman history and literature. The *De Oratore* is the best of these compositions. For here Cicero can speak out of a richer personal experience than fell to the lot of any Greek theorist. Whatever slips a specialist may detect in the verification of the quotations or in the accuracy of the translations of Greek technical terms, there can be no doubt that Cicero had a life-long familiarity with the principles of Greek rhetorical theory. He did not seem to cram them up for his book. And so he writes with a freedom, a sweep, a mastery that make his treatment much more interesting than any professorial text-book could be. The discussion takes the form of a debate on the old rhetorical question: Is the orator a tricky specialist—master of an art of knack of words, or must he be a broadly and philosophically educated man? But a much more definite significance is given to the problem by the fact that the speakers are Roman senators who can draw their arguments and illustrations from a long experience in the practise of the Roman law. At times we seem to be listening to English statesmen, recalling the parliament of Burke and Fox, at times to American lawyers telling stories of cases in which Choate was pitted against Webster. In the frame work and interstices of this debate Cicero contrives to insinuate a sensible and readable account of the main body of Greek rhetorical doctrine in which the technicalities are rapidly and sometimes contemptuously summarized, while the interesting ideas or practically helpful suggestions are brought into the foreground. The book has been well-edited and is accessible in translations. It is the best introduction to the more detailed and prosaic work of Quintilian, and to the more special study of the Greek sources.

Here I must break off rather than come to an end. You would not in any case wish me to recite to you the names of the countless Greek rhetoricians who continued to rewrite every form and type of rhetorical treatise in the next four or five, nay ten or twelve centuries. Still less to enumerate all the hair-splitting refinements of their definitions, divisions, classifications, and terminologies. With more time I might have tried to entertain you with the dry humor of some of the precepts of Quintilian's caustic common sense:

Don't try to write better than you can.

Dress is not the chief requisite in an orator, but it is the most conspicuous.

When you have to strain your voice, put the strain on your ribs, not in your head.

What these modern stylists call punch is really intoxication.

To register emotion is not a figure.

A man can pretend to be a philosopher and get away with it, but you can't simulate eloquence; you have to deliver the goods.

But have I answered the question, What is there in it for you as students and practical teachers of the theory and "art of speech"? I might repeat that somewhere in this vast body of ancient rhetorical literature you will find at least a hint of every useful idea that modern study of the subject has suggested, and that in the four or five best of these old books, these ideas are presented with a directness, simplicity, lucidity, and above all an immunity from the infections and pretensions of pseudo-science that few ambitious modern text-books attain. But you may reverse the argument and say that all that these ancients have to teach can also be found somewhere in the best literature, French and English, of today if one knows where to look for it. That is true, and it is not easy in the present temper of the world to prove to anybody who is not already convinced, the necessity of the value of anything that used to be called culture, of any knowledge of the past, or for that matter of any study of theory except perhaps engineering, or indeed of any higher education. You can become a millionaire or a senator without any of these things. And animal spirits, vivacity, fluency, magnetism and a good voice will make a very effective popular orator of a man who has never heard a philosopher or opened a book of rhetoric and literary criticism.

I am tempted to fall back on vague generalities, on the old-fashioned notion that a specialist ought to have at least enough intellectual curiosity to study the history of his own specialty; or on Cicero's saying that not to know about anything that happened before you were born is to remain always a child. But this again would carry weight only with those already persuaded. Having spent all my life in studying the literature and thought of the past and trying to link it with the thought and literature of the present in the larger unity of the human spirit,* I should feel baffled and helpless in the face of an uncompromising and implacable modern-

*Cf. Shorey, "The Unity of the Human Spirit," in "Representative Phi Beta Kappa Orations;" Boston, 1915.

ism that cares only for those things whereof the memory of a flapper runneth not to the contrary.

Our query is in another form the old problem, what is the value of history? The most obvious answer would be its direct explicit lessons and their immediate application to the problems of today. But those who have reflected most profoundly, felt most nobly, and spoken most eloquently about history would not put it in that way. The too-hasty and overconfident exploitation of historical analogies for immediate use in political life, is the mark of the fanatic and the sciolist. History may be philosophy teaching by example, but the lessons are often obscure and the interpretation doubtful. What is not doubtful is that some acquaintance with the great human story and the intelligence of the unity of the human spirit can be won only in this way, and once won will enlarge the vision, deepen the sympathies, quicken the imagination, make supple the intelligence, and so help us to become better scholars, better teachers, and better men.

REPORT ON COLLEGE ENTRANCE CREDIT*

J. WALTER REEVES

Peddie Institute, Hightstown, New Jersey

THE committee is glad to be able to report progress. In its report last year at the national convention held at Cleveland, it was my privilege to give the results of a questionnaire which had been sent out to college and university presidents. This questionnaire was to determine the attitude of college presidents toward the matter of giving college entrance credit to Public Speaking done in secondary schools. More than fifty per cent of the colleges reported that they were willing to give entrance credit in one form or another, and one hundred per cent were of the opinion that better and more advanced work in Public Speaking could be done in colleges if the fundamentals were covered in secondary schools. The deans of some of our leading universities, such as Columbia and Johns Hopkins, replied that they felt that not only better and more advanced work in Public Speaking could be done in college, but also in many other subjects if the fundamentals of Public Speaking were covered in secondary schools.

All of this was good news and seemed to indicate that the time was ripe for pressing the matter of college entrance credit. As a result the association last year voted unanimously on the following recommendations:

1. That Public Speaking work in preparatory and high schools should be organized according to the time requirements of the standard college entrance unit, either for a full or a half unit.

2. That we strongly urge that teachers of Public Speaking in colleges have personal interviews with their college presidents or deans and bring the matter of entrance credit to their attention.

3. We recommend that a definite effort be made to have

*Read at the Annual Convention of Teachers of Speech, Chicago, 1921.

the subject of entrance credit for Public Speaking work presented at the annual conference of college presidents, principals, and head masters such as the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Eastern States and Maryland; for it is at such conferences as these that an agreement is often reached as to what should constitute units for college entrance credit.

Let us take up these recommendations in order and see if they have been carried out:

It is my understanding that a committee has been appointed and is ready to report on standardized courses such as will meet the requirements of colleges for a unit or a half unit of entrance credit.

The results of the second recommendation are difficult to determine, for the work depended upon the college teachers here represented. I am sorry to say that I suspect this most important recommendation has not been carried out to the extent that it should have been. At the close of the report I may be bold enough to ask the president for permission to learn by a show of hands how many have seen fit to take this matter up with their president or dean where entrance credit is not allowed. Fellow members, to my mind, this whole task could be vastly simplified and advanced if the college teachers of the subject would bring the matter to the attention of the proper authorities. If you can't conscientiously do this, then let us know why you can't in open discussion. If you feel that the work is worthy of being recognized then, it seems to me, it is your duty to help advance the work. But I am digressing.

The third recommendation had great possibilities for good. Part of these possibilities have been realized. Our worthy president, Professor Drummond, and the chairman of your committee have both brought pressure to bear upon some of these associations and as a result Professor George Wm. McClelland, executive secretary of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland planned to have the matter brought to the attention of his association at its meeting in November. An unusual agitation on another subject made it impossible to bring the matter up. However, Professor McCelland—who had expressed himself as very much in sympathy with the subject and who feels that it is of much importance—wrote me under date of November 29th as follows:

"I shall bring the matter to the attention of the Executive Committee,

which will meet about the first of January, leaving it to the discretion of that body whether we should appoint a special committee to report on the matter at the next convention, or whether it would be better to make the matter of entrance credit for Public Speaking one of the topics to be discussed at the next convention."

In a subsequent letter he writes:

"If the Executive Committee decides to appoint a special committee I shall ask you for suggestions as to who are most interested in the question and who have already collected the most valuable information."

Dr. Robert L. Kelly, Executive Secretary of the Association of American Colleges, writes under date of December 14, as follows:

"There has been no opportunity for me to bring this matter before the Association of American Colleges since you wrote me during last April.

"If you will write a succinct statement of exactly what you would like to have the Association of American Colleges do, I will place it before the Executive Committee for consideration. Our annual meeting occurs at the Auditorium Hotel, January 12–14."

In order to give these executive secretaries an opportunity to see how general the interest was in this matter, I sent them the report of this committee made last year, which included the results of the questionnaire mentioned above as well as the recommendations referred to above, which were adopted by the Association. I also sent out letters to the principals and headmasters of a number of leading secondary schools, asking them to write to these secretaries and stating why they believed that work done in Public Speaking, as carried on in their schools, was worthy of college entrance credit. I asked these men to send me a copy of their letters in order that I might know how they stood on the matter. I think that you will be interested in some of these letters, hence I shall quote from four of them:

Rev. H. G. Buehler, Headmaster of the Hotchkiss School:

"I am an enthusiastic supporter of making Public Speaking a part of college entrance requirements for both boys and girls in our secondary schools.

"I think that good solid work in that subject ought to be recognized by colleges for entrance credit. Power to speak effectively is certainly one of the most useful accomplishments that any school can give an American citizen.

"It is doubtless true that instruction in Public Speaking in the schools is at present not sufficiently definite and well organized to justify the colleges in accepting it for entrance credits. I think the answer is that if the colleges will indicate what they would be willing to accept in Public Speaking, the schools will rise to it as they have done in other subjects."

Dr. R. W. Swetland, Headmaster of the Peddie School:

"The more I think about it, the more I am impressed that it will be greatly to the advantage of American education if the colleges can be induced to take action allowing at least one unit of admission credit for a standardized course in Public Speaking. To my way of thinking, there is no part of a boy's preparation which is of more value to him than his training in that art. In our experience at Peddie, we find that our boys not only become proficient in the art of public speech, but that the training which they get in that line is of great value to them in their other studies. They read better, understand more clearly what they read, and thus master their other lessons with greater ease and thoroughness."

Dr. Alfred E. Stearns, Principal of Phillips Academy:

"I have earnestly wished that our college relationship might be such as to force us, in the secondary schools, to carry courses in Public Speaking as a part of the college preparation plan. When properly handled these courses are of immense value in training of boys and fitting them for those high fields of service which are supposed to be the aim of every higher institution of learning. If the colleges could see their way to require Public Speaking as an admission subject, without adding to the load, in connection with the present admission requirements, it would be a good thing for the colleges and for us."

Dr. Mather A. Abbott, Headmaster of the Lawrenceville School:

"Nothing would give me greater pleasure than to find that the Association of College Presidents have become interested in the question of giving a place to the Department of Public Speaking in the requirements for college entrance.

"Hardly a father comes to Lawrenceville who does not ask me whether or not we have a department of Public Speaking, and if his boy will be taught how to get on his feet and make himself intelligible to his audience. These gentlemen have told me that this is one of the great necessities in all business today—the ability to express one's self clearly and convincingly when on one's feet. They have gone further and have informed me that it has been a great surprise to them, in listening to a man otherwise great in his profession or business, to find out that he is unable to express himself properly when he is before an audience.

"Surely a matter of so great importance should be recognized by the colleges as worthy of deep consideration in regard to the entrance requirements. I feel very strongly on the subject and I must congratulate you from my heart on the deep interest which your Commission is taking in placing this matter before the College Entrance Examination Board."

To show still further the interest that the movement has aroused in secondary schools, it is a pleasure to report that in New York State the Board of Regents have accepted for two credits a course outlined and used by R. B. Guinther, of the Utica Free Academy. In my own state of New Jersey, at a recent convention

of all of the secondary schools of the state, the administrative section of the convention, made up of all the superintendents and principals, asked two teachers of Public Speaking to present papers on the importance of the subject. It was my privilege to be one of the speakers and to present the matter of adopting standardized courses which would be acceptable for college entrance credit.

The reaction was favorable and the Assistant State Commissioner of Education asked that we work out a syllabus for courses in Public Speaking, and he would then send it out over the state and recommend its adoption. That syllabus is now in the process of making.

Thus ends the report; however, I would like to have an opportunity to make some remarks and suggest some recommendations.

In the first place, it seems to me that we are on the eve of the greatest step that has been yet made in this matter of entrance credit. This step we hope will be forward, but it may be backward. Within the next two weeks, at least two big associations that play a vital part in agreeing upon what shall constitute college entrance credit, are going to consider the matter. If they do not see fit to report the matter favorably to their associations, it will be a backward step. If they do act favorably and appoint a special committee to investigate the matter and report at their next convention, or if they decide to make it a topic for discussion at that time, in either case, it behooves us to bring all influence possible to bear upon the matter that the report may be favorable. What is to be the final result upon their convention floors will depend almost entirely upon what this association decides to do. A committee of four with its members scattered all over the United States, cannot do the work alone. There must be a concerted action of this association which will make it clear to these associations and their committees that each and every teacher of Public Speaking in secondary schools and colleges is standing like a solid wall back of this movement. If we are half-hearted about the matter, they will be likely to respond in the same way. We must get into their hands convincing arguments why the work should be given on entrance credit. We should, if possible, have a speaker at each of these conventions. We should interview individual members of these associations, especially where they are the heads of our own institutions. We must make it clear that in order to get results, the college catalogs must set forth that

they allow entrance credit, otherwise the secondary schools are left in the dark as to whether or not the college allows entrance credit for the subject. It should be understood also that colleges which report that they allow entrance credit for Public Speaking in connection with English are not in reality allowing credit for Public Speaking as such, for those colleges will not allow any more credit for English where Public Speaking is included than where it is omitted, and most secondary schools have their hands full in fulfilling the requirements for English alone. Therefore, the committee would like to make the following recommendations:

1. That this association send by telegraph, today, a vote of thanks to the secretaries mentioned above for their willingness to bring this matter before their executive committees and their associations.

2. That each college teacher make it a point to learn whether or not this college or university allows entrance credit for Public Speaking, and if it does not, to try to convince the president or dean that the institution should.

3. That the association as a unit request the different associations that have to do with entrance credit, (a) that they give this matter their most careful consideration; (b) that if they give entrance credit they should be careful to publish it in their catalogs; (c) that they differentiate between English and Public Speaking.

4. That the association determine what is the most effective way of getting the proper information before these conventions of college associations.

5. That this association adopt certain standardized courses for Public Speaking in secondary schools and use the most effective way of getting syllabi of these courses before the proper college authorities.

I believe that the next year will be a year of great advancement for this important matter if we, as an association, individually and collectively, get behind the movement.

THE CRIME AGAINST PUBLIC SPEAKING*

WARREN CHOATE SHAW
Knox College

WHEN a person undertakes to brand publicly any particular act or practice as a crime, he ought to speak only after the most careful deliberation and with a full knowledge of the serious nature of the charge that he is making. At the very outset, therefore, in my remarks, I wish to make perfectly plain the fact that I have not chosen lightly or jestingly the title of my paper; but that, in all seriousness and soberness, I mean to point out what, to my mind, constitutes literally a crime against public speaking.

It would not be very difficult, I imagine, for various persons in this audience to point out many different acts and practices associated with our work that they might denominate as crimes; but the practice about which I propose to speak is so general and so far-reaching in its disastrous consequences, that I believe it deserves to be called, not merely *a* crime against public speaking, but rather *the* crime against public speaking.

If any act or practice that we tolerate or encourage in our profession destroys our educational standards; leads us to neglect the overwhelming majority of our students; impairs our efficiency as academic teachers; promotes, through us, fraudulent educational advertising; forces us as academic teachers to stake our reputation and our future on a mere gambler's chance; deprives us all of proper academic recognition; and prevents young men and women of the highest type from enlisting in our profession as their life work; then I say that such an act or practice constitutes a crime that I intend to point out to you today.

I know that this crime, when it is mentioned, will immediately raise up for itself numerous defenders and more numerous apologists—chiefly young and inexperienced men and women who, with the courage of ignorance, are willing to put their heads into a noose;

*Read before the National Convention of Teachers of Speech at Chicago, December, 1921.

a few foxy old veterans who have played with the dice so long that they know how each is loaded; and a vast throng of outsiders who would develop public speaking according to the standards and by the same means that prize-fighting is promoted.

I know that, when this crime is mentioned, it will raise up an army of defenders and apologists, but I know also that it should raise up, and probably will raise up, within our profession another large army of those who believe that there is no valid defense or apology for it.

The crime of which I speak is the toleration and encouragement that is being given to coaching among academic teachers of public speaking. It is the crime of giving instruction in the subject of public speaking solely by the coaching system. It is the crime of forcing academic teachers to surrender their academic standards for those of the coach by being compelled to undertake the work of a coach. It is the crime of attempting to arouse interest in the academic teaching of public speaking through inter-collegiate contests that are organized, directed, and maintained on a basis of coaching. It is a crime, then, that may be summed up in a single word; it is the crime of coaching, which represents a method of instruction that is undermining the very foundations of our profession, and is spreading its poison throughout our whole educational system, in schools, colleges, and universities, wherever these may be situated, East or West, North or South, in every part of the country.

Few of us, I believe, fail to realize when we are giving instruction according to the methods of a coach rather than according to the method of an academic teacher; but if there are any here who maintain that there is really no distinction between these two types of instruction, I want to convince them immediately that there is a vast difference between them. There is as much difference between them as there is between the two poles. The coach may say that his method of teaching is really only one form of academic teaching, because it is essentially a system of individual instruction, which is approved by many authorities on academic teaching. So far, so good; but the analogy goes no further. The gap that must always separate the coach from the academic teacher is that the coach undertakes to prepare a few selected pupils by short-cut methods for single occasions to make an exhibition or to win a victory; whereas the academic teacher undertakes to prepare large numbers of unse-

lected pupils by intensive and thorough training for any and all occasions that they may be called upon to face in their future life-work. If you have any doubt as to whether you are doing the work of a coach or the work of an academic teacher, just bring yourself to answer these questions: Are you teaching only a few pupils whom you have selected from the great mass as the most promising specimens you can find? Are you attempting to instruct them in only a few points that are important for only one occasion? And are you focusing your attention on making a brilliant exhibition or winning some kind of contest? If this is the kind of work in which you are engaged, then you are a coach, and it is shallow reasoning to think that you have any claim to being a regular academic teacher.

Before I proceed further, however, to denounce the crime of coaching in connection with academic instruction in public speaking, I wish to express my thorough appreciation of the talent that is required to be a coach. I pride myself on being an academic teacher of public speaking; but I have had, nevertheless, a varied experience in coaching, and I have maintained my position in that field long enough to feel that I can give a good account of myself. I know that no work is more fascinating, more stimulating, and more thrilling than this kind of teaching; and I know also that the talent required for this work excels the talent that is required for many other forms of teaching. I hope, sincerely, that I can do full justice to the coach in my admiration for his ability; but this is all beside the point. In spite of the admiration I have for a coach, I am bound to say without hesitation that a system of coaching employed in connection with the academic teaching of public speaking is the greatest of all crimes that can be committed against our profession.

The first charge that I have to make against the practice of coaching as a crime is that it destroys our educational standards; for, under a system of coaching, it is absolutely impossible to give the student any broad foundations for his subsequent work in public speaking. It is impossible to give him any true perspective on the relative importance of preparation for actual public speaking in real life as against the kind of preparation that is usually given for school-boy exhibitions and artificial inter-scholastic competitions. And it is also impossible to make him feel that the first object of his education should be to obtain the ability to stand absolutely on his

own legs and not be dependent upon support and assistance from others. Instead of developing breadth, and vision, and self-reliance in our students, we develop by a system of coaching the exact opposites of these qualities,—narrowness, short-sightedness, and an almost unbelievable dependence upon others for direction, advice, and assistance.

The second charge that I have to make against the practice of coaching as a crime is that it leads to neglect of the overwhelming majority of our students. The very nature of coaching is such that the instructor must give his attention to a few and neglect the many. His object is to get results, to make a display, to win victories, and to establish a record for himself in the shortest possible order, and by the easiest and quickest methods available. He has no incentive to work for the great body of students who need his instruction most. These students give him no opportunity to display his talents. They will not win victories for him. Why, then, should he waste his precious time and energy in helping them? The coach is shrewd. He is looking out for himself, first, last, and always; and, hence, whenever he can, he shuns all responsibility for the uplift of the great mass of students who look to him for help and guidance.

The third charge that I have to make against the practice of coaching as a crime is that it impairs our efficiency as academic teachers. Any one who knows anything about coaching in our schools colleges, and universities, knows that it is the most arduous, difficult, and fatiguing work in which a teacher can engage. Day after day, for weeks at a stretch, a thorough coach works without rest through long hours until he almost reaches the point of mental and physical exhaustion. He puts his whole mind and his whole soul into his coaching; and, when that is done, he has little strength or spirit left for academic teaching. Almost invariably, therefore, the effect of combining coaching with academic teaching is to impair the efficiency of the teacher, at the very point where he can do the greatest good for the greatest number, in his work of regular classroom instruction.

The fourth charge that I have to make against the practice of coaching as a crime is that it promotes fraudulent educational advertising. Every coach hired by educational institutions, if he is worth his salt, puts something into the work of his pupils which he thinks will bring it up to the standard that is necessary for popular

approval or for a judge's decision. How far can he go in contributing to the work of his pupils is a matter of ethics; and surely there is no law to prevent him from actually composing entire speeches for his pupils to claim as their own and then making his pupils learn them in perfect parrot-fashion. To think that this is not done in thousands and thousands of cases is to have the credulity of a child. But what of it? It is simply a matter of fraud. The school places before the public the work of its hired coach as if it were the work actually done by its students; and it says in effect to prospective students, "If you come to our school, this is what we will teach you to do." Such advertising, of course, is mere fraud; and the profession of public speaking teachers, so far as they tolerate the practice of coaching, are parties to this fraud.

The fifth charge that I have to make against the practice of coaching as a crime is that it forces men in our profession again and again to stake their reputation and their future on a mere gambler's chance. Every coach in inter-collegiate contests is hired to win those contests; and, if he fails, his reputation and his future are at stake. Yet what security has he in such an occupation? Only that of a gambler. He has to take the chance of finding suitable material on which to work. He has to take the chance of accident, or sickness, or total collapse among his pupils. He has to take the chance of meeting an opposing coach who is his inferior. He has to take the chance of meeting foul play. He has to take the chance of biased judges. And he has to take the chance of satisfying standards of judgment that have never yet been formulated and that never will be subject to investigation. All these chances the coach in inter-collegiate contests has to take; and so, I say, it is a crime to force an academic teacher unwillingly to stake his reputation and his future on the gambler's chance in coaching.

The sixth charge that I have to make against the practice of coaching as a crime is that it deprives us all of proper academic recognition. There is no blinking the fact that the one thing teachers in our profession desire above all other things is academic recognition that places them on a plane of equality with teachers in all other subjects of academic instruction. Yet why is this denied us? In part, at least, because our subject is one that has been handled so long by those who claim to be able to teach it all as coaches in a few primary lessons. The coach, then, to a great extent, is

responsible for the impression among our fellow-teachers that our subject is a superficial subject, a shallow subject, and a subject that may be either ignored or entrusted to the hands of amateurs and hangers-on. The coach is responsible in great part for the failure of the schools and colleges to give us proper academic recognition.

The seventh and last charge that I have to make against the practice of coaching as a crime is that it prevents young men and young women of the highest type from enlisting in our profession as their life work. New recruits as teachers we can find easily; but the number of these new recruits who year after year retire from public speaking is appalling. In no other branch of teaching, I believe, is there any such mortality. And what is the explanation? Why will teachers refuse to remain permanently in our profession? I think I have the answer. They see the effect upon it of our toleration and encouragement of coaching. They see that they must fight continually against being driven from the regular class-room into coaching. They see that they are in constant danger of losing their highest educational standards. They see that they are likely to have to sacrifice their desire to serve the many and undertake the narrow work of slaving for a few. They see that they face the possibility of being thrown into work that year after year will bring them near to mental and physical exhaustion. They see that they, like others, will probably have to stake their reputation and their future again and again on a mere gambler's chance. And they see finally that the profession for which they are asked to sacrifice so much will not be given equal academic recognition with others that call for much less sacrifice. By tens and hundreds, therefore, they desert us, and leave the bulk of our instruction in the hands of novices. And all this, I believe, is due to the fact that we, as academic teachers, tolerate and encourage the practice of coaching. Is it any wonder, then, that many of us regard this practice as a crime and the greatest possible crime that can be committed against ourselves and the subject that we teach.

Now, I know that there are many connected with our profession who will take issue with me directly on every charge that I have made against the practice of coaching as a crime. I know that there are many who maintain that coaching presents the most effective means of giving instruction in our subject. I know that there are many who believe that the coaching system is so engrafted on our

profession that we could not get rid of it, even if we would. And I know that there are many who believe that, if we should eliminate all coaching in connection with our academic instruction, we would thereby kill off all instruction in our subject. With such views I have absolutely no sympathy. But the mere fact that there are such views indicates to me very clearly that the problem of coaching, as an alleged crime against public speaking, is one of the most serious, the most delicate, and the most intricate that men and women in our profession must bring themselves to consider.

There may not be any single mode of procedure by which we may settle this problem. Various modes of procedure, in fact, will probably be necessary. But are we, as a profession, undertaking to settle this problem by any mode of procedure whatsoever? We are undertaking to settle many problems, as for example, the problem of high school courses; the problem of entrance credits; the problem of beginning courses; the problem of separation from English; and the problem of research. But what are we doing to settle this problem, which is likely to prove more vital than any of the others? Is it not high time that we, as a profession, should take some definite action to cope with the problem of coaching—a problem that many of us believe involves the greatest of all crimes against the future of public speaking in our schools?

SOME THEORIES CONCERNING STUTTERING AND STAMMERING*

MAY KIRK SCRIPTURE, B. A.
Columbia University

NEARLY sixty years have passed since that neglected genius of the medical world, Hughlings Jackson, propounded his theory of language, yet only with recent years, observes the *British Medical Journal*, has its vital importance been dimly understood. Jackson did not shrink from approaching his subject from the psychological side as well as from the standpoint of anatomy. Jackson pointed out that healthy language consists of two separate forms: intellectual, i.e. the power to convey propositions; and emotional—the ability to exhibit states of feeling. Over forty years later, Dr. Pierre Marie startled the medical world by a pronouncement like "an earthquake to our cherished beliefs in cerebral localization." He asserted that the third frontal convolution does not play any special part in the function of language, and that what is called "Sensory Aphasia" could no longer be accepted. At the present writing, Dr. Henry Head, an eminent English authority, who examined many young and healthy war patients, suffering from head wounds and who had developed slighter and more specialized defects of speech than are met with in disease, concludes that had it not been clearly appreciated before, it would have been obvious from observation of this class of patient, that there is no single psychological function or faculty corresponding to speech. Words convey only hints. Gradually men agree to limit the scope of hints conveyed by particular words and phrases until a conventional dialect is arrived at. Words are not only the names of ideas in the mind; they are also the signs of the connection that the mind gives to ideas one with another. Dr. Head does not allow that language can be considered to be a function apart; it may suffer impairment in common with any mental process which demands for its performance exact comprehension, voluntary recall, and perfect expression. In

*Read before the Phonetic Society, February 11, 1922.

this conclusion, we have been aided by the advice of experimental psychology of the kind that has immortalized the name of Wilhelm Wundt. With this theory of language (Intellectual and Emotional, according to Dr. Head) in mind, the subject of Stuttering, both from the theoretical and practical sides, will be approached.

Stuttering has been recognized as a disease for many centuries and many theories have been advanced concerning its etiology. Numerous writers upon the subject, differ in regard to the importance of the causative agents. Fletcher states that a good many recent writers on this subject have called attention to the fact that the diagnosis of this condition has passed through several distinct phases. The first stage considered that the seat of the malady was in the peripheral organs, the tongue being the chief offender. Gradually the seat of the difficulty has been shifted from the peripheral to the central region. The theories as to just what the nature of this mental involvement is, are quite numerous.

However, before taking up the subjest of theories in detail, let us devote a few moments to considering accurate definitions of terms which are necessary for any scientific investigation.

CHART I

German: Stottern
Stammeln
STUTTERING

Difficult Speech

1. Peculiarities of Speech:
   - a Spasmodic contraction of lips, tongue, etc.
   - b Mouth wide open, producing ah, ah, ah, etc.
   - c Unable to speak at all.
   - d Unable to speak certain words.
   - e Unable to speak when suddenly spoken to.
   - f Unable to telephone.
   - g Unable to introduce.
   - h Embarrassment, Shame.
   - i Self consciousness.
   - j Mental haste (cluttering).
2. Causes:
   - a Nervous shock from:
     - 1 Severe falls.
     - 2 Ghost stories,
     - 3 Practical jokes
     - 4 Surgical operations.
   - b Intense fear.
   - c General overanxiety or psychoneurosis.
   - d Mental contagion (Imitation: parents, friends, deaf mutes).
   - e After whooping cough and other

English: To Stutter
To Lisp
STAMMERING

Mispronunciation

1. Lisping:
   - a Organic.
   - b Neurotic.
   - c Negligent.
2. Negligent Speech:
   - a Colloquialisms.
   - b Illiteracy.
   - c Environment
   - d Carelessness
   - e Inaccurate conceptions.
   - f Defective hearing.
   - g Foreign accent.
3. Organic Defects:
   - a Cleft palate.
   - b Hare lip.
   - c Jaw deformitories.
   - d High palatal arch.
   - e Fallen arch.
   - f Hemiatrophy.
   - g Deviated septem.
   - h Tongue tie.

children's diseases (exhaustion).
f Spastic infantile paralysis (difficulty in using muscles of speech).
g Neuropathic condition.
h Nervous exhaustion.
i Left handedness.
j Speech conflict.

CHART II

To avoid confusion of the terms stuttering and stammering, it has been suggested that technical terms be adopted to designate the two fundamentally different defects.

SCRIPTURE Proposes:
Hypophonia=Subenergetic Phonation.
Hyperphonia= Superenergetic Phonation.

MAUKEN Proposed:
Stuttering=Dyslalia or Difficult Speech.
Stammering=Pseudolalia or Incorrect Speech.

The words, "Stuttering" and "Stammering," have grown up among us because of their acceptance as synomyous terms, and have caused a great deal of confusion because of the attempted explanations of them, no two being alike. We may understand, then, with Fletcher that the translation of the two German words, "Stottern" and "Stammeln" (whose acoustic similarity accounts for both terms being used for variations of the same defect), be translated literally, "to stutter" and "to lisp"? The term "Stammering" will then represent the various defects of *pronunciation,* (the definition for "Stammeln") including these noted in the Diagram under "Stammering".

Fletcher says, in offering a psychological study of stuttering, "In order to avoid confusing stuttering with other forms of speech-defect, it will be necessary to adopt differentiation of the several groups of defects, such as follows:

"1. That class of speech defects resulting from disease or lesions in those portions of the brain that have to do with the function of speech, known as Aphasia.

"2. That class of speech defects designated as 'Stammering' (which we understand to mean mispronunciation). The stammerer, unlike the stutterer, can always speak, but his speech is incorrect.

"3. That class of speech defects designated as 'Stuttering.' This group is distinguished from the foregoing types mainly by its intermittent character. Stuttering may be called a temporarily appearing inability to begin the pronunciation of a word or syllable. The capacity of the stutterer

to speak, seems to be related to certain mental attitudes or states of mind. It is this characteristic that gives the subject its psychological interest."

Upon the subject of "Stuttering" the following theories will suffice to show that there have been many attempts at an explanation, but few of them satisfy. In quoting from some of these already accepted authorities, we note that most authors agree in believing that there is usually a *predisposition* on the part of the patient who stutters, no matter what may be the exciting cause. Dr. Hudson Makuen[1] stated that the most important factor in the etiology of stuttering was heredity, and this notwithstanding the fact that stuttering is an acquired affection, in the sense that speech itself is an acquired faculty.

Gutzmann,[2] besides agreeing that heredity is a very important factor, tells us that he considers stuttering, more or less, a matter of temperament, claiming that most stutterers are excitable and hasty.

Some authors, like Schrank,[3] believe that stuttering is mostly found among the mentally deficient and feeble minded children (we rather think, with Gutzmann, that non-intelligent children are more inclined to lisp than to stutter).

Blume[4] holds that the most immediate cause for stuttering is a disproportion between thinking and speaking, i.e. that the command of language does not keep pace with the development of the thinking powers, or that the process of thinking is too fast for the undeveloped articulatory organs to express.

Liebmann[5] considers nervousness as the real foundation (both hereditary and acquired) for stuttering, and lays special stress on the abuse of alcohol and masturbation.

Schmalz[6] considers a cramped condition of the vocal cords a primary cause for stuttering.

Merkl[7] believes that stuttering is of pure psychic origin, while Rosenthal[8] and Benedikt[9] consider it a "Coördination Neurosis."

Wineken[10] thinks that in all stutterers the will power is bounded by doubt (language doubt).

Coen[11] believes that all stutterers show some nutritive disturbance of the organism or some underdevelopment of the thorax. There is great exception taken to this theory becauses it is well known that many stutterers are Herculeans in stature and health.

Berkhan[12] considers that rickets is the main etiologic factor in

stuttering and says that the changes of the palate and jaw in rickets are similar to those met with in idiots, imbeciles and deaf-mutes.

Freud,[13] Steckel[14] and some other psychologists believe that stuttering is the outward expression of an inward mental conflict.

Hoepfner[15] compares active stuttering with the complicated processes of learning to walk. He claims that a stutterer is delayed by strong cramp-like movements when he endeavors (as in accomplishing the act of walking) to overcome any defects by reflecting upon them.

Froeschel[16] thinks that the nucleus of stuttering lies in the psychic condition of the patient who becomes conscious of the ataxically disturbed speech movements.

Nadoleczny[17] considers the exigencies of the first few school years as the momentous factors of stuttering.

Kraepelin[18] suggests that the psychic disturbances are two-fold, —expectation neurosis and anxiety, the former of which causes the unconscious twitchings (impulses to activity) of the muscles of speech, and the latter increases the stuttering because the fear of being laughed at, reproved or scorned, increases the anxiety.

Scripture[19] states in his "Stuttering and Lisping," that the most frequent cause of stuttering is a nervous shock. Serious falls, ghost stories and practical jokes and terrifying experiences, such as are met with at amusement resorts, are often causes for these mental shocks. Then he says there is a mental contagion by intentional or unintentional imitation; the condition of exhaustion that follows diseases, such as whooping cough, scarlet fever, measles, etc., and a neuropathic disposition.

Bluemel[20] considers that stuttering is due to a transient auditory amnesia.

Browning[21] says that "stammering appears in many cases to be associated at the start with large thymus, if not directly caused thereby." (A possible connection with either the endocrine glands in general or the thymus in particular.)

Swift[22] thinks that stuttering is an absent or weak visualization at the time of speech.

Kenyon[23] says, "In all the multitudinous efforts to solve the etiology of this distressing disorder, no direct effort has been made in this connection, as far as the author knows, to analyze either the physiologic difficulties involved in speech development, or the bear-

ing on the problem of the psychology of the speech developing child, and yet certainly more than 95 per cent of the cases of stuttering developmental processes of the speech development period, involve gain control of the complex speech function. The phycho-physical developmental proceses of the speech development period, involve not only the creation of new thought processes and of language for their expression, but also coincidentally the acquirement of a knowledge of, and a skill in using, the peripheral physical apparatus for the expression of these new thoughts in words."

Now, turning to another medical point of view, we have Dr. Smiley Blanton[24] on "The Medical Significance of the Disorder of Speech," in which he states that "The speech area has not been demonstrated in the brain at birth, and the development of speech is not inevitable. An intact auditory apparatus, the presence of intelligence, and the intact nervous and muscle system are required for its proper development, plus certain emotional and social demands and situations, under the stimulus of which it is organized. In speech disorder, there are early and invaluable symptoms of anomalies of intellectual and emotional growth, as well as organic difficulties of the nervous system." Dr. Blanton's account of his interesting study of the war neurosis cases at Base Hospital No. 117, states that probably 5 per cent of the men had some sort of disturbance of speech, either a complete loss of speech, or a break in rhythm. Among his conclusions, he believes that there is some fundamental weakness in the motor mechanism, but that stuttering results depend not only on the degree of the weakness in the mechanism, but also on the ability of the individual to protect this mechanism from undue strain.

Fletcher's[25] opinions upon the etiology of stuttering are so scientifically sound, they make a fitting climax to all these varying theories just quoted, regarding, as he says, "this old, old malady, whose record dates back at least to the Egyptian hieroglyphics. While medicine has made almost unexampled progress in the understanding and treatment of human diseases, and has added to the list of those that were formerly unknown, there is in the medical world today little more than a confusion of personal opinions and theories in regard to stuttering." Again he says, "When the physician does not feel himself justified in the administration of drugs, he is frequently disposed, if the patient is a child, to say to the par-

ents that he will 'grow out' of the defect. This is, sometimes, a mere evasion. At other times, it is another example of a belief unwarranted by actual facts." Again, Fletcher says, "Two conclusions seem inevitable, first, that stuttering is a mental defect, and second, that the treatment of it should be primarily educational rather than medical. Both the physician and the psychologist of the present day are having more problems thrust on them than they can solve, and neither is anxious to assume new burdens. Yet, in the interest of suffering humanity, it seems to me to be time for the two sciences to come to an understanding regarding the matter of laying aside the subject of scientific and professional jurisprudence; it should be emphasized that this problem is too big to be handled by the side-line practice of the physician."

There are still many more theories which might well be quoted, but these are sufficient to help us reach an agreement as to the general character of the affliction and sum it up as essentially a mental abnormality.

Turning now to the other side of our problem, that of the therapeutic measures to be employed in the correction of speech disorders, we must first study the symptoms and the attempts at correction.

Glance for a moment at such proven facts as, First, the relative *frequency* of stuttering among boys and girls which ranges from 2:1 to 9:1, this preponderance of males being afflicted is due, according to Liebman, to the female's greater dexterity and grace of movement and to the well known fact that girls learn to talk much more easily than boys. Gutzmann believes this fact is due to the different methods of breathing employed by males and females. Second, the three different *ages* at which the defect occurs: (a) at beginning to talk; (b) at second dentition or school age; (c) at puberty—the adolescent period. Third, the three *stages* of stuttering:

1. Pure Habit
   - Imitation.
   - Shock or exhaustion cause inaccurate movements of speech muscles.
   - Embarrassment.
   - Awkwardness in using speech organs.
2. Fright Stage
   - Psychoneurosis.
   - Violent emotions.
   - Intellectual paralysis.
3. Stage of Indifference
   - Habit firmly fixed.
   - Peculiarity of character.
   - Found in older patients.

Fourth, *symptoms:*

1. Cramps or Spasms of Speech Muscles.
   a. Abdominal cramps, always.
   b. Expulsion of breath before breathing.
   c. Continual irregularities of breathing during speech.
2. Laryngeal Cramps.
   a. Muscles become tense and fixed.
   b. Tone becomes monotonous, hard, and often husky.
3. Cramps and Spasma of Muscles and Enunciation.
   a. Lips pressed too tightly together—short or long time; or will open and shut, producing a series (P. B. M.).
   b. Tongue pressed too tightly against hard palate. (T. D. N.)
   c. All sounds may be similarly affected.
4. Contraction of Muscles not Ordinarily Used in Speech. Example: twist head; screw up eyes; contort whole body; grimaces; tongue stuck out between lips; grunting; whimpering.
5. Over-tenseness of Hypertonicity of all Muscles Involved in Speech (Psychic).
6. Starters: er, well, now, why, etc.
   a. Inarticulated but complicated grunt.
   b. Repetition of starters.
7. Excessive Rapidity of Speech.
   a. Mental haste.
   b. Nervous anxiety.
8. Lack of Confidence in Ability to Speak Well.
   Fear; watching too far ahead for words he cannot say; nervous prostration; fear of being ridiculous; mental flurry; hesitation in thought; increased sensitiveness; sadness.

While Gutzmann and Kussmaul may disagree, and Liebman and Steckel may see the cause of stuttering lying in different directions, Fletcher taking exception to Bluemel and Swift, and Swift, at great length refuting Kenyon's statements, how are the speech disorders being cured?

Professor Liebman's methods, as far as it has been possible to adapt them to the English speaking stutterer, are the foundations of a great many of the modern attempts to systematize a method to work upon, but the treatment or reëducation of stutterers is still in a chaotic condition; the work, where it includes drill on particular letter positions being, as Dr. Smiley Blanton says, actually pernicious. By this method treatment is usually aimed at the symptom itself, he further stated, and where relief is given to that, the underlying temperamental disability is left untouched. Right here it might be well to note that the *less* the stutterer thinks of his speech, the better, but the *more* the clutterer thinks of his speech the better. Liebman, Bluemel, Blanton, Scripture, and Browning, feel that this problem, for so many years left in the hands of quacks and charlatans and untrained people, is most distinctly a medical problem, and that neuropsychiatric training is necessary for the diagnosis

and treatment of these patients; while on the other hand, psychology, as Fletcher points out, has its place in the correction of stuttering. As he says, stuttering is to be differentiated from other speech defects (1) on the ground of its intermittent character, (2) by reason of the fact that it is not associated with organic lesions, and (3) by reason of the fact that it is conditioned on certain states of mind in the form of emotions, feelings, attitudes or ideas. These various symptoms of the stutterer may be divided into three general headings: (1) physiologic, (2) psychophysical, and (3) mental. Under the physiologic heading we find in the first place disturbances of breathing. The psychophysical symptoms, according to Fletcher, are those physiologic changes which are associated with, or conditioned on, alterations in mental states, changes which have to do with processes not directly related with the function of speech. The treatment then, we conclude with Fletcher, should be primarily more educational than medical. That is. a reëducation of the emotional attitude toward speech, which will include relaxation, breathing, poise, muscle training and distinct articulation. More particularly the *individual* character should be studied and individual training according to his needs given.

From the number and variety of the causes just enumerated, it is possible to get a rational idea of how complex disturbances of the speech function are; and in good judgment, it is apparent that the source of the difficulty must be found before anything like a cure can be attempted. In all cases of stuttering, as well as in the more severe cases of mal-articulation, the factors of self-consciousness and nervousness are always present, and the sufferer, therefore, must be treated with utmost gentleness, kindness and tact. In children particularly, it is first necessary to quiet them and then to set about eliminating their self-consciousness. They should be given exercises which interest them and make them forget their speech difficulty, until new, correct speech habits are formed that will crowd out the old pernicious ones.

"The human brain is capable of only one emotion at a time, and if it be filled with curiosity or scientific enthusiasm, there is no room for fear," says Conan Doyle. This is most applicable in the stutterer's case; for if he can be induced through distraction to concentrate deeply upon a problem or to forget himself, to force his thoughts from his speech, fear is pushed aside and the speech im-

pulse is free. It is this constant use of mental distractions that will soon start new habits and the matter of smooth speech will assert itself.

Demosthenes, as you know, originated the foundation of a very logical method for the cure of stuttering; first, by putting pebbles in his mouth he started a physical distraction that finally led to a mental distraction; second, he shouted above the noise of the waves to give himself practice in gaining confidence, and, lastly, he ran up hill to strengthen the breathing muscles.

Stammering, as mispronunciation, in its various forms, whether from an organic disturbance, as a functional disturbance or negligence, is a comparatively simple matter and admits of easy handling, if the phonetic relations are thoroughly understood and if patience and time are given to reëducative processes. For this reason, the subject has not been discussed at length in this paper.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

[1]Hudson Makuen. A Study of One Thousand Cases of Stammering, with Special References of the Etiology and Treatment of the Affection. The *Therapeutic Gazette*, June 15, 1914.

[2]Herman Gutzmann. Sprachheilkunde, Berlin, 1912, p. 373, etc.

[3]Schrank. Das Stotterubel, Munich, 1877.

[4]Blume. Neueste Meilmethode des Stotternebels, Leipzig, 1844.

[5]Liebmann, A. Vorlesungen uber Sprachstoerungen, Berlin, 1899.

[6]Schmalz. Uber Stammeln und Stottern.

[7]Merkel. Anthropophonik, Leipzig, 1863.

[8]Rosenthal. Beitrag zur Kenntnis und Heilung des Stotteruebels, Wein, 1864.

[9]Benedikt. Nervenpathologic und Elektrptherapit, Leipzig, 1874.

[10]Wineken. Uber das Stottern. Henle und Pfeufers Ztschr., Vol. 31.

[11]Coen. Sprachanomalien, Wein and Berlin in 1886.

[12]Berkhan. Stoerungen der Sprache und der Schriftsprache, Berlin, 1889.

[13]Freud. Zur Psychologie des Alltagslebebs, 1904.

[14]Steckel. Nervoese Angstzust aende und ihre Behandlung, Berlin, Wein, 1908.

[15]Hoepfner. Stottern als assoziative Aphasie, Leipzig, 1912.

[16]Froeschel. Lehbuch der Sprachheilkinde, Leipzig and Wein, 1912.

[17]Nadoleczny. Die Spracheund Stimmstoerungen im Kindesalter, Leipzig, 1912.

[18]Kraepelin. Quoted by Nadoleczy.

[19]Scripture, Dr. E. W. "Stuttering and Lisping," New York, 1913.

[20]Bluemel, Dr. C. S. Stammering and Cognate Speech Defects, New York, Leipzig, Paris, 1913.

[21]Browning, Wm. The Etiology of Stammering and Methods of Its Treatment, New York State Journal of Medicine, 1911.

[22]Swift, Dr. Walter B. A Psychological Analysis of Stuttering, Journal of Abnormal Psychol., No. 4, page, 225.

[23]Kenyon, Dr. Elmer L. The Nature and Origin of Stammering. Assistant Professor of Diseases of the Throat, Nose and Ear, and in Defects of Speech. Rush Medical College, Chicago.

[24]Fletcher, Prof. J. M. The Etiology of Stuttering. Journal of the American Medical Association, April 8, 1916, LXVI, pp. 1079–1081.

[25]Blaton, Dr. Smiley. The Medical Significance of the Disorders of Speech. The Journal of the American Medical Association, July 10, 1921, Vol 77, pp. 373–377.

THE WEBSTER KEY

MARGARET E. DEWITT
New York City

HAVE you ever looked at old keys in the Metropolitan Museum? Some are of beautiful, intricate workmanship, others almost austere in their massive simplicity; some are large, others small. Most of them give one the feeling that the master workmen knew what they were about when they were making these keys. At times when I think of them I am reminded of the Sankrit alphabet, because of the thought, care, symmetry, and early intelligence that underlies the work.

How often it is the case that the old hand-made objects are far more wonderful than those of the in-between modern period of experimental manufacture. The keys of the latter period fall very short when compared with old ones, and they fall quite as short when compared with the modern, Yale type, keys.

The keys of the in-between period remind me of the so-called "Webster Key to Pronunciation." It certainly cannot be made to fit these modern days of "Yale" philological locks.

May one ask, in all meekness, just which pronunciation is this linguistic "Webster Key" supposed to unlock? May one also venture to suggest that when the unlocking has been completed, the sounds produced by the speaker will be the self-same ones which belong to that individual's usual dialect? If he nasalizes, he will nasalize with equal gusto *after* looking up the word; if he inverts his vowels so that his speech gives the general impression of an electric coffee mill revolving at top speed, then he will continue to grind out his words in the same manner after consulting Webster as he did before. There will be but one added calamity to the general noise: the man will calmly assure you that he is right, because, "Webster says so!"

There is no so-called "key," good or bad, that can help a person who uses a non-standard dialect to attain a standard pronunciation, unless the person has a clear idea what sound each symbol of the key represents. To acquire this knowledge, the person

must be orally drilled in the separate sounds by some one who knows them, or have a detailed description of them—preferably illustrated by diagrams showing the position of the organs of speech.

As for the symbols themselves, used in the Webster Key, they were made with the good intention of helping to solve a difficulty which has never been solved by *them*. They have long since been put aside as inadequate, not only by scientists, but by every one having even a slight knowledge of the spoken language from the specialist's viewpoint.

I have considered it a sign of rare intelligence on the part of private tutors and other teachers, that not one imposed upon me the Webster Key during or after childhood; and I am certain many another person feels equally grateful to have escaped the same thing.

If it is so out of date, why, then, does so splendid a book as *The Webster Dictionary* still cling to this key? The book is revised from time to time in other respects, why does it not turn to modern linguistic science for its sound symbols and method of dealing with the spoken language? Because editors of a long established book hesitate to throw over what has been used and advertised so extensively for so long a time. This is the simple and plausible supposition of a certain well-known philologist.

If that is the case, is it fair to the memory of the man whose name is still used far and wide in connection with this folly as if he were sanctioning it from his grave? Webster was an American—and one meaning of American is, progressive intelligence. Had Webster lived longer he would not have stood still on this or any other important subject.

An advertisement of *Webster's New International Dictionary* has recently been received. It continues to stress the Key and gives much space to it. The symbols are used in *The Americanization of Carver*. The person who has transcribed it evidently knows something about strong and weak forms of words, because the weak forms are used in the words *of*, *a*, and *the*. What about the weak forms of such words as *at*, *was*, *had*, *and*, etc.? Who would use strong forms of the latter words in an entire spoken text? A poorly taught foreigner, perhaps, and others whose speech is equally poor; certainly not anyone using Accepted Standard English Speech. I do not mean that everyone using the accepted form of speech realizes he is

using strong and weak forms. He may do it quite unconsciously, but he will use weak forms at certain times—and properly, too! Also; would a speaker of good English use the same vowel-sound in the second syllable of *appear*, as in the first vowel of *eve?* Certainly not.

There is no space to go into further detail. In *Relative Efficiency of Phonetic Alphabets*, Guy Montrose Whipple gallantly defended the "Webster Key" in 1911. It did harm by influencing people wrongly; it did good by bringing to life a pamphlet by *philologists* entitled, *The N. E. A. Phonetic Alphabet* (with a review of the Whipple experiments) by Raymond Weeks, James W. Bright, Charles Grandgent. These latter names have an international reputation.

The editors of the dictionary must have read both pamphlets.

This is 1921, and the advertisements still continue to laud the misfit KEY. The following is taken from the recently received advertisement:

"The Key . . . shows the correct pronunciations, and will be easily understood because the Webster pronunciation symbols used are familiar to all. (A full list of these is given. . . . They have been adopted for nearly all the *schoolbooks,—25,000,000* published *annually* and are *taught* in *schools.*)" The italics are my own.)

If especially the latter is the case, it would seem necessary to add a word to the name of a group, composed in part of well meaning men: *The Sleeping Board of Education! ! !* May some fairy prince of Knowledge come to awaken them, and a great many others, who are suffering from the same sleeping sickness, before it is too late!

It is unnecessary to go into detail of the Webster Key defects becauses it has been so admirably done by the previously mentioned philologists.

This article is not written for the sole purpose of picking at "Webster." I chose *The Webster Dictionary* partly because it is, rightly, so extensively known and used in America and elsewhere, partly becauses the Key discussions are so unfortunately prevalent that most of us have been drawn in at one time or another. In short, Webster is almost a household word.

In case it affords satisfaction to anyone, I shall add a word about *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*. Splendid as it is in other respects, *it also,* cannot and does not come under the heading of a

pronouncing dictionary, as that term is understood by philologists.

The day is coming when all dictionaries that lay even a slight claim to dealing with pronunciation will discard the use of cumbrous diacritical marks. They will all adopt the same alphabet of which each symbol represents one *sound*, and always the same sound.

Such an alphabet is the one adopted by the International Phonetic Association.

It is not flawless, but it is less full of flaws than most, and is in wide international use in linguistic text-books, etc. For general practical purpose a broad transcription is used; for comparative or more detailed work a much narrower one. That is, small modifiers indicate whether a sound should be slightly raised, lowered, moved to the front or back, aspirated or not, etc.

This alphabet is used by Daniel Jones in his *An English Pronouncing Dictionary*, (on strictly phonetic principles) E. P. Dutton & Co. To use it, one must be well acquainted with the separate sounds of our speech, and the symbols which represent them. At the least, the elementary training in separate sounds should be an oral one, for no matter how well we may speak, we are not born with a scientific knowledge of speech-sounds—not even of our own language.

If it is impossible to take oral lessons it would be well to obtain the same author's *An Outline of English Phonetics*, which contains 131 illustrations and detailed descriptions of sounds.

It may be advisable to add a word concerning Accepted Standard English Speech.* All too often authors do not call it that for fear of antagonizing a multitude of readers, and they get around the difficulty by various master-strokes of diplomacy. Mr. Jones treads cautiously and calls it Public School Speech—a very good term for those who fully realize its English significance. But why avoid the term Standard?

*T. Fisher Unwin has published H. Cecil Wylde's *A History of Modern Colloquial English*. Those who are interested in the subject will find it a book that has a rare mingling of scholarship and beauty. One would like nothing better than to list it under *Biographies*, for to some of us English speech has been a life-long friend and veritable personality. In these pages one can watch the growth of its individuality; one can see how it has lived and moved and had its wondrous being deep in the heart of past generations; and one can see how through that past it has become its glorious musical present personality—for the sounds of Standard English *are* musical, if the speaker will but have them so.

There was a standard of speech for Greek and Latin; there is one for French, Spanish, etc. The English one has existed for hundreds of years. Accepted Standard Speech is merely that form which has been aptly described as *Free from localisms, provincialisms, and vulgarisms.*

It is that form of a spoken language which passes educated, contemporary international muster, which has no glaring highlights or harrowing shadows; that form which through its beauty makes a language worthy of life—and life in its sublime sense is never merely local.

It is this form of our spoken language which every school owes every child and which should be taught there on a modern scientific basis of phonetics.

It is a duty of parents to demand this training for their children. It is a personal duty for all students, who have not had it in childhood, to demand it from colleges, universities, or any other educational institution. They owe it to themselves to obtain the best that is due them in the study of their own or any other language.

Institutions which do not offer these courses are thirty years behind the times, and their instruction in that line is accordingly of a counterfeit nature—perhaps unconsciously so.

Think of the amounts of printer's ink, editor's energy, public money, and brain-power, that are expended yearly to produce, promote, and consume old-fashioned *keys to pronunciation!*

If a tenth of these amounts were expended for the furtherance of acquainting people with the actual sounds of twentieth century spoken English, the positions of the organs of speech for producing these sounds, and a modern phonetic alphabet as symbols for the sounds, it would be an inestimable national gain, and a patriotic service for the future generations.

A UNIQUE SPEECH CLINIC*

JENNIE HEDRICK
Atlantic City, New Jersey

THE speech correction movement has swept over the country like a huge wave, leaving in its wake numerous speech or voice clinics which have been located at various places: in universities, where they have the coöperation of special teachers; at hospitals, to secure the help of the medical men, and in connection with the summer courses in speech correction.

The one at the Georgetown University Hospital not only secures the help and coöperation of the doctors, but aims to interest the medical students in the various forms of speech disorders and their treatment. It stands unique as the only one, as far as the writer knows, where a knowledge of the diagnosis, theories and treatments of the various speech disorders is considered a valuable asset to the medical student.

The call for coöperation is as much heard now as that for efficiency was a few years ago. This appeal is especially strong in the correction of speech defects. A knowledge of phonics and the vocal mechanism is no longer considered all that is necessary to qualify a teacher for the position of a speech expert. The pathological side of a speech defect is receiving as much attention as the remedial or phonetic side. The services of the laryngologist, the otologist, the psychiatrist, the psychologist, and the social worker are in demand. The special teacher may not have a medical degree, yet she must have keen eyes and keener ears and be able to locate the faulty or diseased member through her knowledge of sounds and their production.

Realizing the close relation between the medical and the educational side, the writer was eager to have her work linked up with that of the medical profession. Little did she realize the breadth of the work or the difficulties to be surmounted before her ideal of a model speech clinic could be realized.

*Read at Session—National Society for the Study and Correction of Speech Disorders, March 3, 1921.

Dr. G. M. Kober, the dean of the Georgetown Medical School, grasped the other side of the problem, viz., the advantages to the medical student of a speech clinic in connection with the psychological clinic. With his hearty endorsement and support the first speech clinic in Washington was started at the Georgetown University Hospital five years ago. The uninitiated were bewildered. Was it not an anachonism to have a teacher at a hospital? Had a new medicine been discovered that would correct the stutter or the phonetic defect? Such was the hope of some of the first patients who came to the speech clinic. When they found that their own cooperation was an essential factor they ceased to attend.

Since the first year, during which the work was limited to the correction of the defects, the medical students of the second year have been required to attend the speech clinic—two being assigned to that room every week. They are not expected to learn how to treat the cases, but to observe the method of analysis; to study the pathological background; to gain an insight into the various theories and treatments of the defects; and to aid in ascertaining the seriousness of the diseases.

The cases are diagnosed from the teacher's standpoint. The speech is first studied and, through the defect noted, the pathological cause, if there be any, is located. Is this possible? Can the incipient form of a disease be detected through the speech. In minor speech disorders is not this done by even the layman? Inhibited nasality reveals a cold in the head or coryza; hoarseness reveals a sore throat, etc.

The clear sounding of the vowels shows that the vocal cords are functioning normally.* "Vocal monotony and harshness in both conversation and speech indicate faulty or incomplete development of the vocal cords—a sign of congenital syphilis."

*Dr. W. B. Swift. "Can the Speech Present Signs of Congenital Syphilis?"

Lack of acute hearing has been found to explain the faulty speech known as "baby talk," whether used by a child or an adult. Speak the word into the patient's ear through an ear trumpet and the true sound or a clearer one is given. Auditory amnesia of visual asthenia may cause unintelligible speech. The memory of the sound or image is faint or lacking and the result is confusion of tongue.

As will seem, the correct diagnosis of a speech defect is all important. Through the various disorders the mental, moral and

physical condition of the patient is revealed as well as his social life.

Lest someone should question this last statement, viz., "Through the various disorders the patient's social life may be revealed," a report of one of the phonetic cases is pertinent. The boy (age twelve) was brought to the clinic by the nurse from the Juvenile Court. An examination furnished the following data:

Present Illness—Indistinct speech.

Past History—Boy has always had the defect. No known cause. He is in the atypical school.

Family History—Two brothers have defective speech. The older one, two years older than the patient, is in the atypical school and seems eager to have the trouble corrected. The younger brother does not talk. The mother had a speech defect when a young girl.

With such a family history the director was surprised to observe that the speech of the patient was not exactly that of the feeble minded. The following points of dissimilarity were noted:

1. The initial sounds were stifled. The elisions in the speech of the feeble minded usually occur in the middle or at the end of words.

2. All audible sounds were clear and true, whereas the speech of the feeble minded is slurred and faulty.

3. The omissions seemed to be caused by lack of breath rather than by the failure of the mental grasp.

These peculiarities led her to visit his family before the next meeting of the speech clinic. At the home she witnessed such brutal treatment of the patient by an older brother who could speak distinctly that she could scarcely refrain from reporting the case to the police. The faulty articulation and the expression of repression and distrust were explained. Fear dominated his life as well as his speech.

It may not be amiss to mention some of the things which have claimed the interest of the medical students.

A boy made the sounds of t—d—l with the middle of tongue instead of the tip. The attention of class was directed to the false movement. The tongue was examined and found to be tongue-tied. The lack of acute hearing was the cause of the faulty speech of another patient. The director seized this opportunity to urge a more careful examination of all cases of deafness.

The work of the oral teachers of the deaf in developing the re-

sidual hearing of their pupils was emphasized and the plea for coöperation presented in the pamphlet, "The Deaf Child," by Dr. Max Goldstein, was brought to the notice of the young doctors.

In a class of stutterers, one stuttered only on words beginning with non-vocalized consonants; another on words beginning with vowels or vocalized consonant sounds, and the third had trouble with all kinds of sounds. This led to a discussion of the different theories of stuttering.

As the Freudian Theory of Psycho-Analysis is receiving much attention and credence by the psychiatrists in Washington, that theory as applied to stuttering was explained. Bleumel's Theory of Auditory Amnesia; Bogue's Silent Period followed by drills accompanied by hand movements; Scripture's Theory of Octave Twist; Martin's Drill on Phonetics; and Swift's Theory of Visual Asthenia become familiar to these students and their various values are emphasized.

Incidentally it may be noted that the quick response of a class of colored boys who stuttered, to suggestion was commented upon at one of the sessions.

The voice of the patient whose record showed a positive report after the Wasserman test was analyzed and the Swift sign of congenital syphilis was corroborated. There is seldom a meeting of the speech clinic where some point of interest and value to the med ical students is not shown and discussed.

The query arises, is the dean of the Georgetown Medical School wise in requiring the attendance of the medical student at the sessions of the speech clinic? What is gained thereby?

1. The medical students get a sympathetic insight into the task of the teacher. His work begins where theirs ends. The patience and skill necessary to eradicate a bad habit of speech makes a deep impression on them.

2. They realize that the sooner the correction of the defect begins, the better for all parties concerned.

3. They note that the removal of adenoids, hypertrophied or enlarged tonsils does not correct phonetic defects or stuttering.

4. Their attention is directed to various voice signs through which the teacher is able to locate the diseased member. They will not worry over the vocal cords when true, clear vowel sounds can be produced.

5. The various theories and treatments in correcting stuttering are brought to their attention and discussed.

6. The director depends on their medical skill in ascertaining the extent of the disease and the possibility of a cure thereof.

7. The patient is convinced that his case is receiving all the attention available and so is stimulated to do all he can to correct the defect as speedily as possible.

In conclusion, the hope is advanced that these students will never tell their patrons the threadbare remark that the defect, be it deafness, faulty articulation or stuttering, "will be outgrown, so let nature alone." Such a statement shows the lack of knowledge of the work of the oral teacher of the deaf and the speech specialist.

Recently this speech clinic has had to further enlarge its field. The number of patients necessitated the assistance of a normal student who will receive her training at the clinic and carry out the instructions of the director between the meetings of the speech clinic.

SUMMARY

The uniqueness of this speech clinic consists in the required attendance of the medical students by the dean of the Georgetown Medical School at the sessions of the speech clinic.

The necessity for coöperation between the medical specialists and the speech expert is emphasized.

The correction of a speech defect is shown to have a pathological, remedial, educational, and social aspect.

The speech specialist is able to read the voice and interpret the signs revealed therein. The medical student's attention is called to these signs and their interpretation.

By attendance at the speech clinic the students gain a knowledge of the patience and skill required to correct a speech defect, and the necessity for speech work after an operation on the adenoids and tonsils.

They become familiar with the various theories and methods of correcting stuttering, and last, but not least, are impressed that the threadbare assertion "that the trouble will be outgrown" is no longer excusable.

EDITORIAL

CONTEST JUDGING AND PROFESSIONAL SOLIDARITY

IN this number appears an article bearing the strong title, "The Crime of Coaching." By his stern arraignment of the evils of turning teachers into coaches, Mr. Shaw has opened up a subject that needs thorough airing. If things are half as bad as the article makes them out, something needs mending. As an aid to such treatment the editor of this publication wishes hereby to put himself on record as believing that the greatest drawback to the progress of the teaching of speech and public speaking, *as a profession*, is this matter of bickering over decisions and judges. This conclusion is formed deliberately and carefully after twenty years of embroilment in a hundred and more intercollegiate contests. Now he is convinced that the whole enterprise is a drag on future progress of the profession, as a profession.

The writer would put the case more strongly than Mr. Shaw, but in the direction of jockeying for judges and enjoying recriminations over their decisions. Here is a case in point; is it altogether uncommon? A member of our profession brings his debating team to the seat of another college; there he meets his colleague in the profession. In their one- or two-days meeting they occupy themselves solely with concern over whether the judges are going to arrive on time, whether they are to be instructed thus or so, how they shall be met and entertained while in town and at the debate, and even in a post-mortem as to whether they were chosen on the right basis. The debate occurs; the decision is rendered; the visiting team and their faculty attendant leave the hall at once, stop at the telegraph station and retreat to their hotel or train. This is all the contact the two professional colleagues have.

Or, in a different strain: after the debate and the decision, all repair to a club room or restaurant and eat and smoke and talk. One side has been beaten,—the judge or judges have said so. There

is an air of careful sportsmanship about the meeting; they are all game and good fellows. Yet, down in their hearts, one of the two groups feels that it is the victim of some kind of injustice. On rare occasions a team and its coach will confess themselves beaten; but very rare, indeed. Practically always lurks the conviction that the judges missed something, were somehow incompetent. And next-door neighbor is the suspicion that in choosing these judges somebody slipped something over.

Paint this as rosy as possible in terms of good sportsmanship and fellowship and intercollegiate comity, yet here is what remains as indisputable: two men, professors of a given academic discipline, have met as opponents and not as colleagues. They have given their hours, their energies, and their emotions to pulling apart when they ought to have been pulling together. They meet and talk judges, decisions, contests; they suspect, oppose, and often enough come to dislike each other, yet every hour that they spend together might better be given to the furthering of common ends in a common profession. Contests all too easily keep us enemies when we must be friends.

The writer would add to the case presented by Mr. Shaw, and in the direction of choosing judges. Jockeying for judges and then taking their decisions seriously is little more than a scandal upon a discipline that is working for high academic recognition; we run the risk of becoming our own impeachment; we advertise that we do not care to teach and investigate; we want to win contests and compete for student and faculty approval with the man who coaches the football team or trains the mile runners. So doing we sacrifice academic dignity and forfeit scholastic prestige. We are a college sideshow; our very emphasis invites sequestration into one of the smaller tents. We may at times loom large on the posters and canvas pictures, but we get all too often the ten-cent pickings from the crowd. It can be easily demonstrated by concrete reference to this or that college and university that progress in academic recognition has borne a direct ratio to freedom from the tyranny of choosing judges and worrying over decisions.

Haggling over judges, before or after a contest, is about the meanest occupation a professor can engage in if he is to have any claim to his professorship. Aside from the hours worse than wasted on looking up records of prospective favorable judges, such

occupation itself is merely mean. There is lack of dignity, educational value, or credit to one's ideals in looking over another professor's nominations with suspicion and fear. After Professor A has challenged a list of names Professor B has submitted, a chord has broken that ought to be left whole. Two men who ought by mutual understanding and coöperation to be collaborating in advancing their common profession of teaching speech or public speaking, have wasted possibly hours of valuable time, have learned to suspect each other's motives, have sowed seeds of discord if not of hatred, and have set up barriers of distrust and dislike that no common sympathy for kindred interests can ever wholly abate. Two co-workers have become estranged, preferring to shun each other's company and convinced each that the other is a suspicious character.

Exaggerated? Not a whit where the coach usurps the place of the professor and takes all this decision frivolity as of any serious value; or where one party to the struggle elects to win his debates before the teams meet.

The time is about ripe for a general declaration of independence—*general*, please note— from the curse of choosing judges and taking their decisions seriously. We wish much success and activity to the new committee on the evils of coaching—and the choosing of judges; they have in their hands much of our future professional well-being.

SUMMER SCHOOL PERSONNEL

The suggestion has been offered that the personnel of summer session faculties is a matter of general interest to the profession. Accordingly in the June number of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL a statement would be appropriate of changes and interchanges of teachers for the summer. If the information is in hand the editor will make a place in the next number for a summary of this item of news.

THE FORUM

EASTERN PUBLIC SPEAKING CONFERENCE

The Eastern Conference Meets Monday and Tuesday
APRIL 17TH AND 18TH, 1922

In Houston Hall, University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia

The Executive Committee send the following greetings: The time is almost here, and as you see, the program promises to be good. The papers will be short, with time for discussion; and we throw in an extra discussion or two for good measure. Note the special session for normal school teachers—a feature this year. Note also the afternoon session on Tuesday. Because of the city environment and the distance of the University from the hotel and theatre district, it seemed unwise to attempt a Monday evening session. We substitute the strong program for Tuesday afternoon; so plan your trip accordingly.

PROGRAM

Note: As usual we omit all academic titles except in the case of guest speakers.

MONDAY, APRIL 17

10 . *M.—Call to Order*

Address of Welcome—Acting Provost Josiah H. Penniman, LL.D., Univ. of Pennsylvania

The Department of Speech and The College Curriculum
Miss Mary B. Cochran, Vassar College

Discussion.

Problems of Speech Training in the Normal Schools
Dr. Albert Lindsay Rowland, Director of the Teachers' Bureau, Pennsylvania State Department of Public Instruction

Discussion. Five-Minute Speeches by

Miss M. Katharine Hill, Bridgeport, Mass., State Normal
Miss Effie G. Kuhn, Trenton, N. J., State Normal
Miss Charlton Locke, Lock Haven, Pa., State Normal
Miss Cora E. Everett, West Chester, Pa., State Normal
and others

Luncheon tendered by the University

1 P. M.
2 P. M.

The Work of The Swarthmore Chautauqua
Paul M. Pearson, Director

Gesture in Public Speaking
Henry Wilson Smith, Princeton Theological Seminary
Discussion.

The Smith-Dartmouth Debate
Miss Elizabeth Avery, Smith College
Discussion.—Led by J. M. Winans, Dartmouth

The Field of Rhetoric
Hoyt H. Hudson, Cornell University
Discussion.

Round Table Discussion on Curriculum.

TUESDAY, APRIL 18

9 A. M.

Business Meeting

Literary Study as a preparation for Oral Interpretation
Frank H. Lane, University of Pittsburgh
Discussion.

Fundamental Principles in the Vocal Interpretation of Literature
Miss Edith Burford, Ohio Wesleyan University
Discussion.

Improving the Speech by Correlation and Co-operation
Dr. Bonaventure Thomas, Manhattan College
Discussion.

Impression and Expression
Horace K. McKee, Union College
Discussion.

Luncheon tendered by the University

1 P. M.
2 P. M.

Standard English
Clarence Griffin Child, L.H.D., Professor of English Language and Literature, University of Pennsylvania
Discussion.

A College Course in Dramatics
Miss Ruth Jackson, Pennsylvania State College
Discussion.

Dramatics at Wellesley
Miss Elizabeth P. Hunt, Wellesley College
Discussion.

Round Table Discussions "Should Declamation Be Abolished?"
Adjournment.

PRESIDENT MERRY GIVES GREETINGS AND APPOINTS COMMITTEES

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION:

We have every reason to be proud of the National Association of Teachers of Speech. It may be accepted as a permanent factor now. Academically, we have been accepted. If we can accept a common purpose and program of endeavor within, our continued existence is assured. The JOURNAL, also, is a success. Its standard is high and editorial policy definite. Although your officers realize they cannot please all the people all the time, they welcome your suggestions and advice.

The adopting of a program of meeting annually at points near our centers of greatest membership is a step toward a sound policy. There must be no east nor west among us. We are as strong and as weak as our united purpose. I feel certain that there are no methods of teaching common to one section of the country alone. (I believe public speaking is stressed equally in the East as in the West.)

Were I to entertain a definite hope for this year's achievement of the Association is would be this, that we develop a self-consciousness as an organization. There are fields of service which will enlarge our academic scope. For some years I have felt we should be paying more attention to the study of oral reading, especially the teaching of oral reading in the grades. Certainly the teaching of phonetics would fall within the acceptable purposes of our academic interests. I do not believe that the teaching of oral work of any kind should not receive the attention and even the specialization of

some of our members. Years ago, the small group of us who clung to the one phase, public speaking, were never able to develop the interest and publication that we now succeed with. I hope, therefore, for a year characterized by an increasing realization of the need of unity in so far as seeing the other person's interest is concerned, even though we do not find our training and special interests just like his.

The matter of terminology will likely come up again in the report from the Committee on Nomenclature. It was with great care that the search for a committee was made. The Association wishes all the light on the subject it can get, I am certain. I am equally certain that the Association would feel it quite an indignity for a committee outside the Association to act. I, therefore, selected those in whom the members have imposed greatest confidence, the presidents of the Association, past and present. This committee may call for such advice as it needs outside the membership as well as within.

For the Committee on Debate, I have tried to select those who will be interested and fair. The committee should report on coaching conditions, as to whether "sharp practice" exists.

The purpose of the Committee on Investigation and Research will continue to be the same. Additional bibliography will be supplied the JOURNAL, if room to print it can be found.

The Committee on Normal Schools and Teachers' Colleges will be continued with instructions to bring in further recommendations.

The Committee on College Entrance Credit is doing good work and we wish it to continue.

Probably the most vital committee is the Committee on Membership. I wish it were possible to see the members in the far western states, especially the coast states, organize a sectional conference that might ally itself to the National.

The Committee on Better Speech Movement and Organizations should take up the consideration of a definite program.

Respectfully submitted,

GLENN N. MERRY, *President.*

APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES

Nomenclature—J. A. Winans, chairman; J. M. O'Neill, J. L. Lardner, H. S. Woodward, C. H. Woolbert, A. M. Drummond, and G. N. Merry.

Debate—(Investigation of certain evils of the coaching system.) E. D. Shurter, chairman; C. E. Cunningham, Robert West, H. L. Ewbank, Albert M. Harris, G. A. Collins, Frank Brown.

Research—The Board of Assistant Editors, the QUARTERLY JOURNAL.

Normal Schools and Teachers' Colleges—Lousene Rousseau, chairman; Agnes Laughlin, John Barnes, Eloise Ranney, Effie G. Kuhn, Cora E. Everett, Ruth Williams, Lois Stone.

College Entrance Credit—J. W. Reeves, chairman; G. D. Wilner, Harry Caplin, Olive Hart.

Membership—Lousene Rousseau (secretary of the Association), chairman; W. C. Troutman, Mrs. Perle Shale Kingsley, Dwight Watkins, R. B. Dennis, Mrs. E. P. Hunt, G. R. Collins, D. W. Redmond.

Better Speech Movements and Organizations—Frank Rarig, chairman; Mrs Smiley Blanton, Henrietta Prentiss, Lew Sarrett, L. E. Bassett, Floyd Muckey, J. Q. Adams, Claudia Crumpton, J. Duncan Spaeth, E. C. Mabie, T. C. Trueblood.

Secondary Schools—H. B. Gough, A. E. Keiber, Andrew Weaver, Susan B. Davis.

IOWA STATE MEETING

THE Iowa State Association of Teachers of Speech held their second annual meeting at Morningside College, Sioux City, Iowa, February 16, 1922. In conjunction with this meeting the Drama League of America also met, the two associations holding joint sessions.

The following is the program:

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1922

10:00 *Speech in High Schools*
PROF. VANCE MORTON, Correctionville High School
Discussion

10:30 *The Problem of Judges*. PROF. CHAS. A. MARSH, Morningside College
Discussion

11:00 *Significant Tendencies in Speech Education*
PROF. E. C. MABIE, State University of Iowa
Discussion

LUNCH

2:00 *Problems and Methods of Play Production*
MRS. MARGARET JAYNE COLLETT, Upper Iowa University
Discussion

2:30 *The Children's Theater* . . Miss Marienne C. Gould, Sioux City
Discussion
3:00 *Organizing Community Drama* . . . Member of Drama League
Discussion
3:30 Recital . . . . . Miss Josephine Johnson, Penn College
4:00 Business Session—Election of Officers, etc.
8:00 Play given by Iowa Little Theater Circuit

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1922

LITTLE THEATER SESSION

9:00 *Drama League Little Theater Circuits*
Mrs. A. Starr Best, Evanston, Illinois
9:30 *Organizing a Little Theater Circuit*
Miss Ina K. Trisswell, Mason City
10:00 *Problems in Circuiting Plays in Iowa*
Prof. James Haynes, Morningside College
10:30 Symposium by Members of Little Theater Circuit Committee
2:00 Iowa Collegiate Woman's Extemporaneous Speaking State Contest
8:00 Iowa Collegiate Woman's Oratorical State Contest

Margaret Jayne Collett, *Sec.-Treas. I. S. A. T. S.*

NEWS AND NOTES

Professor Glenn N. Merry, of the University of Iowa, has been granted six weeks leave of absence this spring to pursue certain studies at Columbia University.

The General Council of Delta Sigma Rho, honorary speaking fraternity, will be convened at Iowa City, Iowa, April 27, 28, 29. The Iowa chapters will act as host.

Professor E. C. Mabie, of the University of Iowa, will spend a portion of the summer as a member of Stuart Walker's Repertory Theatre Company, Indianapolis.

The one-man judging system is used this spring by the Midwest Debating League, composed of the Universities of Wisconsin, Michigan, and Illinois. The same system was employed in the triangular debate between the Universities of Wisconsin and Missouri, and Washington University.

The college debating league composed of Knox, Grinnell, Beloit, and Carleton Colleges has adopted a new method of selecting judges. Each of these colleges happen to be in a different state, so the selection of the judges for the debate occurring in each state is left to the head of the department of Speech or Public Speaking at the state university of that state. Four names are submitted with the privilege of only one veto. The two colleges concerned most agree on three of the four nominations.

The following instructions to judges—rather to the judge—were used in a recent debate. What is such a sheet worth? This question is interrogatory, not rhetorical.

1. That the debate shall be judged in each instance by a single expert judge to be mutually agreed upon by correspondence between the two interested universities.
2. That the expert judge shall be especially instructed to render what

is known as a critic's vote, awarding the decision to the team which in his opinion does the best work in debating. That in coming to his decision he shall consider at least the following ten elements:

(1) Analysis; interpretation of proposition; plan of case.
(2) Completeness and accuracy of knowledge.
(3) Reasoning; inference based on evidence presented.
(4) Clearness of utterance; ease to hear; pronunciation, enunciation.
(5) Strength of evidence.
(6) General conduct towards opponents, judges, audience, etc.
(7) Ability in extemporizing.
(8) Use of English.
(9) Power or effectiveness in public speaking.
(10) Ability in rebuttal.

3. That the judge shall not be instructed to give any definite per cent to each of these elements, but shall weigh each one according to his own judgment.

4. That when judges are asked to serve in this capacity, a copy of these instructions shall accompany the invitation.

5. That the judge shall agree to give an oral detailed criticism of the debate when he announces his decision, or else to the teams and faculty representatives assembled together after the debate is over.

STANDARDS FOR PUBLIC SPEAKING CONTESTS

Have you ever entered a candidate in a public speaking contest, and after the verdict gone home so disgusted with the decision that you vowed you would never again have anything to do with a similar contest? Yes? Shake. Have you ever been a judge in a public speaking contest where there were six or more candidates and found a unanimous agreement as to the ranking of the several contestants? Now, frankly, do you know of any contest of any sort where there is such a manifest lack of unanimity as in a contest in public speaking?

There are at least two reasons: (1) Judges are seldom competent; and (2) when competent they fail to use like standards.

We would like to see the antiquated and obsolete "oratorical" replaced by a modern and practical "speech" contest, and the "Bobby Shaftoes-Curfew Must Nots" by a contest in *reading*. However, as long as we must have these "oratorical pyrotechnics" and the "yallercutin," would not the following score cards afford just criteria by which to judge them?

FOR ORIGINAL ORATORICAL CONTESTS

1. Composition (50).
   A. Material
      (a) Originality ---------- 5

(b) Purposefulness ---------- 5
(c) Appropriateness ---------- 5
(d) Interest ---------- 10

B. Style.

(a) Clearness ---------- 5
(b) Power ---------- 5
(c) Eloquence ---------- 5
(d) Unity ---------- 10

2. Delivery (50).

A. Platform bearing ---------- 10
B. Emphasis ---------- 10
C. Force ---------- 10
D. Voice ---------- 20

100

FOR DECLAMATION CONTEST

1. Choice of selection (20).

A. Length ---------- 5
B. Appropriateness ---------- 5
C. Quality ---------- 10

2. Delivery (80).

A. Spirit ---------- 15
B. Platform bearing ---------- 15
C. Emphasis ---------- 15
D. Force ---------- 10
(a) Loudness.
(b) Volume.
(c) Intensity.
(d) Stress.
E. Voice ---------- 25
(a) Enunciation.
(b) Purity.
(c) Melody.
(d) Quality, etc.

100

J. R. PELSMA, Professor of Public Speaking, S. M. T. N.

A DEVICE FOR STUDENT CRITICISM

The following has proved a very effective device in my beginning course in Public Speaking. On certain days each member of the class is asked to provide himself with a 3 x 5 card for each of the speakers of the day. He is asked to place on each card the following information: the speaker's name, the principal elements of his effectiveness, and his chief faults, with suggestions for improvement. He hands in his own name with this group of suggestions, but on a separate card. The class is requested not to write during

any of the speeches, but a minute or two is allowed after each speech for this purpose. Sometimes the device is varied by asking the different members of the class to watch particular elements of the delivery, one sense of communication, one platform movements, another gestures, etc. The cards are then inspected by the instructor, who can throw out any objectionable ones, and are given to the students for whom they are intended at the next meeting of the class. The purpose of the device is—

1. To give the class an added interest in the speeches, making them more attentive and thus helping the speaker.
2. To catch points of criticism which may slip the instructor.
3. To place the weight of the opinion of the whole class on the most obvious points of criticism.
4. To give the instructor an added insight into the student's comprehension of the principles of effective delivery.

J. H. HATHAWAY, *University of Michigan.*

A PLAN FOR A SCHOOL OF PLAY DIRECTING

Ray L. Holcombe, of Kansas Agricultural College, is offering a course in the directing of plays. Following is an outline of his plans and projects:

TEXT: One-Act Plays by Modern Authors, by *Helen Louise Cohen,* (Harcourt & Brace).

SUPPLEMENTARY TEXTS: Fifty One-Act Plays, *Shay* and *Loving,* (Stewart Kidd Co.); Modern One-Act Plays, by *Mayorga,* (Little Brown); and Modern American Plays, *Baker* (Harcourt & Brace); Choosing a Play, *Johnson* (Century).

FACILITIES: Stage fully equipped with lighting devices and scenery. Class-rooms for lectures, demonstrations and rehearsals.

METHOD: Lecture, demonstration, rehearsal, experience.

I. Lecture.

(a) Terminology of the stage.
(b) Choosing a play.
(c) Casting and the tryout system.
(d) Directing *vs.* Coaching.
(e) Plotting the scenes.
(f) Preparation of the director.
(g) Conduct of the rehearsal.
(h) Rehearsal problems.
(i) Costuming.
(j) Scenery and scene design.
(k) Make-up.
(l) Lighting effects.

(m) Electrical devices.
(n) Business management.
(o) Theatrical advertising.
(p) Duties of the stage manager, props, etc.
(q) The one-act play.

II. Demonstration.

(a) Terminology demontrated with action on stage.
(b) Plotting scenes. Board work—plotting of plays shown here.
(c) Costuming—illustrated with costumes of some play or plays.
(d) Scenery and scene design—illustrated with model stage.
(e) Make-up demonstration by director.
(f) Lighting effects—on model stage, on actual stage.
(g) Electrical devices on stage.
(h) Business management of some play.
(i) Theatrical advertising — problems given in advertising some play.
(j) Duties of stage manager, etc., certain play.

III. Rehearsal.

(a) Observation at rehearsal by director.
(b) Reference to rehearsal work at meeting of directors.
(c) Make-up.
(d) Planning of costumes, scenery, etc.

VI. Experience.

(a) Carrying into practice using one-act play publicly shown, make-up, costuming, lighting, and all details managed by director.

AIMS: First of all, I should say that dramatic education should have as its primary aim the ultimate elevation of public taste through intelligent presentation of worthwhile drama.

All colleges and universities throughout the country are presenting plays. Whether or not these plays are of commendable character and whether or not they are presented artistically depends upon whether a suitable direction of this activity is provided. The aim, then, should be to train more leaders in the field of direction, that they may know what to do, how to do and to be vitally interested in making the activity worth while.

It is perfectly apparent that most of our colleges and universities do not have adequate means for the carrying on of dramatic activity to its fullest efficiency. However, we find still more apparent the fact that colleges and universities do not make intelligent use of what little material is provided. The use of means and adaption to situation is one of the things greatly emphasized.

We are aiming to make a clear distinction between the old type of "coaching"—the old school of mimicking prevalent among

readers and impersonators—and the educational type—"directing." In fact we bar the word "coach."

We aim to put every member in our school through his paces in every field of the work, from scene shifting to wardrobe attendant, from make-up artist to prompter, from business manager to actor and from errand boy to director.

In stage setting, scenic design, make-up, and in the various phases of direction we encourage originality but not freakishness.

MECHANISMS: We have our class-room lectures and demonstrations in my room which I use for regular class room recitation. Our lectures are of the seminar type and each member presents his particular problem which he has encountered in the working out of his play. We use the one-act play for it presents the best material for experimental purposes because of its shortness, its simplicity and because public presentation is less difficult than it is with a longer play. We charge no admission for our performances. Problems in lighting, etc., are illustrated with diagrams on the board and by going over the lighting system installed in the theatre here and allowing each member to operate the dimmers, switches, etc., that he may see "how it is done." Terminology is one of the first things taught and they are required to use this in all their work. Make-up is taught by lecture, demonstration, practice, and experience. By that I mean that lecture is given, then demonstration by the director, individual practice by the directors under the supervision of the director and lastly experience in making up a cast or a part of a cast for public performance—problems in the working out of the business phase of the theatre; duties of the different officers who are responsible for that; the planning of a play campaign; theatrical advertising; taking a play on the road; casting the play; how to handle the rehearsal.

THE LABORATORY

MEASURING THE REACTION OF THE AUDIENCE TO AN ARGUMENTATIVE SPEECH

WILLIAM E. UTTERBACH
Dartmouth College

FOR the purpose of impressing upon my students of Argumentation the necessity of analysing the audience and, in the light of that analysis, of aiming the speech at the particular audience, I have been in the habit of holding "post-mortems" with the student on his speech. The value of the "post-mortem" is tremendously increased if the student and instructor know with some accuracy just what the actual reaction of the audience to the speech was. Since this knowledge is not usually available I have been experimenting with several devices for registering the reaction of the audience. All are some variation of the following plan: Before the speech each member of the classroom audience records his present state of mind toward the position to be maintained by the speaker by writing on one side of a three by five card, "Strongly favorable," "Slightly favorable," "Neutral," "Slightly opposed" or "Strongly opposed" (to the speaker's position). The hearer is also invited to write down briefly the main reasons, if he has any, for his present state of mind on the question. Immediately after the speech each hearer records in the same manner on the back of the card his "after taking" state of mind together with any reasons in explanation of it which he may care to state. This data, which, when collected and tabulated, is usually very illuminating to the speaker, is made the basis of our "post-mortem." As the hearers are usually very frank in indicating which arguments did and which did not impress them favorably, it becomes possible not only to tell how many hearers were converted, how many were

unmoved, and how many of those already favorable to the speaker were strengthened in their belief, but also to put one's finger on the arguments which were and those which were not effective.

I have used a modified form of this device in judging class debates. Before the debate each member of the audience records his present state of mind on the question to be debated by writing on one side of a card, "Strongly favorable," "Slightly favorable," "Neutral," "Slightly opposed" or "Strongly opposed" (to the affirmative side of the proposition). Immediately after the debate each member of the audience records on the other side of the card his "after taking" state of mind toward the affirmative side of the proposition. The cards are collected and the decision made in the following manner. The five different states of mind toward the affirmative side are represented numerically as follows:

"Strongly favorable".. +2
"Slightly favorable".. +1
"Neutral"..... 0
"Slightly opposed" .. —1
"Strongly opposed .. —2

The "before taking" state of mind of each member of the audience is stated numerically according to the above table and the whole added algebraically. This sum represents the audience's state of mind before the debate. Its state of mind after the debate is determined in the same way. The decision is then awarded to the team which, according to this calculation, has succeeded in pulling the audience in the direction of its goal. For example, if the state of mind of the audience was —16 before and—3 after the debate the Affirmative team has won. If the state of mind of the audience has not changed during the debate the decision is a draw. This method of rendering decisions seems to work well with small class-room audiences. It would, of course, be out of the question with large audiences, as at an intercollegiate debate, for instance—unless the decisions were based on the reactions of a jury of representative hearers scattered through the audience. The members chosen for the jury, which might number two dozen or so, would be neither experts in weighing evidence nor in debating nor would they necessarily be "prominent citizens." An attempt would be made to make them simply representative of the

audience. They would be instructed to consider not the skill shown in debating, but only what they consider to be the merits of the question. It would, of course, be important that the reaction of the jurymen be uninfluenced by personal sympathy for either team of debaters. This might necessitate holding the debate in neutral territory. As a method of judging intercollegiate debates this device has several obvious practical disadvantages. I throw it out merely as a casual suggestion for the consideration of those interested in the "judging" problem.

TEST FOR DETECTING CONSONANTS INCORRECTLY OR INDISTINCTLY PRONOUNCED BY A SPEAKER

It has been observed that much of the unintelligibility of student speech is due to the fact that the speaker pronounces certain consonants incorrectly or indistinctly. If the instructor knew in the case of each student which were the troublesome consonants he might easily devise a set of drill exercises in pronunciation for overcoming the difficulty, but it is usually a rather difficult and tedious task to determine which consonants are causing the trouble. In an effort to devise a test for use as an aid in this diagnosis I have been experimenting with the following: The speaker, seated with his back to the audience, reads slowly a list of nonsense syllables which contains all of the consonants, each appearing an equal number of times. Each member of the audience writes down the syllables as he hears them, spelling phonetically. The written lists are collected, corrected and the results tabulated. The data thus obtained indicates very clearly which consonants were misunderstood, and, therefore, incorrectly or indistinctly pronounced.

WILLIAM E. UTTERBACK.

NEW BOOKS

Public Speaking Today. By LOCKWOOD-THORPE. Benjamin H. Sanborn & Co., Chicago, New York, Boston.

> "*Public Speaking Today* is planned as a practical texbook for use in a general year's course in high school public speaking."
>
> "The kind of public speaking that men care most for today is plain, strong, earnest talk; like everyday conversation, only more carefully considered, more orderly, more forceful."
>
> "The book is intended for use in high schools in the junior or senior year, taking the place of the usual rhetoric or literature, or both."
>
> "When the authors began to search for a complete modern textbook on the general subject of public speaking, written for high school students and adapted to their particular needs, they were able to find only a bare beginning in the field."
>
> "It is with the hope, then, of meeting a real need that the author offers this book to the school public."

The above excerpts are taken from the Preface of *Public Speaking Today*. The writer of this review believes that the authors' hopes are justified, and that in offering their book to the public they have met a real need not heretofore satisfied by any other book written for the same purpose. There is an unusual charm in the expression of forceful, genial personality, indicated in the plain, strong, earnest talks to young people in the pages of this book. The subject-matter in every chapter is interesting, suggestive, stimulating, and practical. The style in which it is presented is eminently suited to high school students, simple, clear, direct.

The way in which the many allusions are made to books and their authors considerably extends the usefulness, and greatly adds to the value, of the books to young people.

Part I is called First Steps in the Art of Public Speaking. The first four chapters, How to Get Material for the Speech, How to Build the Speech, How to Win and Hold an Audience (two chapters) deal with what is commonly understood as public speaking.

Chapters V, VI and VII present How to Utter the Speech, including such topics as the voice, correct and effective speaking, and platform decorum. The contents of these three chapters on How to Utter the Speech lead as naturally to effective reading as to the effective delivery of the speech.

Those who are interested in a revival of the art of pleasing and effective reading in the home and school as well as in public may regret that Chapter VIII, which consists of selections to read aloud, is called merely "Exercises," and not, what would seem more suitable, "Exercises in Oral Reading." Surely this branch of "public speaking" deserves that much definite consideration.

Part II. Some Important Forms of Public Speaking, includes discussion and exercises in the Impromptu Talk, the Informal Address, the Formal Address, the Oration, the Debate, the After-Dinner Speech, Everyday Conversation, and the Spoken Drama. While the chapter on the Spoken Drama is suggestive and helpful, this phase of high school work might well be given more extended treatment.

Part III, with its three chapters on the School Organzation, What to Do and How to Do It, and How to Make the Most of a Public Meeting, concludes the book of two hundred sixty pages.

Because of the dearth of specially trained teachers of speech, writers of high school text-books on public speaking have for a number of years been making an especial effort to produce a book which "any teacher" may use with a minimum amount of danger to the pupils under her instruction and at her mercy. Whatever the confessed motive of the authors of *Public Speaking Today*, it seems to the writer to be the best book yet presented for use by either the trained or the untrained teacher, for the following reasons:

The illustrative material is wisely chosen by men who understand young people.

The exercises are practical, permitting as much independent choice and action as are probably wholesome for the pupil, and at the same time taxing the teacher for advice and guidance to a degree limited only by her own choice.

The many references to famous and interesting men, women, events, and books, are of a kind to stimulate investigation and wide reading.

The directions given are simple and direct, requiring a min-

imum amount of interpretation and discussion by the teacher, while permitting a maximum amount of practice in speaking by the pupil.

The exercises advised for self-training in voice placing, enunciation, articulation and breathing are simple, sane, and sufficiently novel and entertaining to make it probable that pupils will practice them until some definite improvement in speech habits has been attained, with a minimum amount of damage done.

B. F. H., Chicago, Illinois.

How to Speak, Voice Culture and Arts. By ADELAIDE PATTERSON, Professor of Public Speaking at Rhode Island College of Education. Little, Brown & Co., 1922.

The author, Adelaide Patterson, strikes the keynote in this little volume of 158 pages, called *How to Speak* in her sub-title, *Exercises in Voice Culture and Articulation with Illustrative Poems.* Speaking, in the larger sense, is not touched upon; the author is concerned only with the operation of the voice mechanism as a means of expression. Practicability is visible in every page of it, for there is a decided absence of theoretical discussion with a predominance of exercises and aids to correct the voice.

Help—grateful, necessary help—for the impoverished teacher is to be found; not only for the teacher but for his student; necessary tools, including good diagrams of the vocal organs and of the breathing apparatus, scales for the practice of correct sounds, and selections are present for any person interested in the development and culture of his own voice. Its selections are of the kind which will make the book beneficial in high schools or in the upper grades. In fact, a good dose of what the volume affords might be profitably given to all students in high school as a requirement for graduation. Good practical common-sense, plus simplicity, is displayed in trying to reach the average high school girl and boy through the poems and selections. Some of the old standards are found, but a noticeably new and individual choice marks the book as a very modern one.

One cannot fail to quote one passage, before closing, which characterizes the personality back of the book, and challenges every teacher, "It is to be hoped that the time is not far distant when this work will be considered just as much a part of the regular

school program as the so-called essentials,—that it is as necessary to general culture as any other line of education."

An attractive handbook of voice-culture, interesting for its simplicity, its helpfulness, and its practicability.

S. E. N., Urbana, Illinois.

CLASSICAL RHETORIC AND ORATORY

The Rhetoric of Philodemus. Translation and Commentary by HARRY M. HUBBELL. Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences. Yale University Press. 1920. pp. 139.

Cicero: A Biography. By TORSTEN PETERSSON. University of California Press. 1920. pp. 699.

The Correspondence of Marcus Cornelius Fronto. Edited and translated into English by C. R. HAINES. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. New York, Putnam; London, Heinemann. 1919.

The Silver Age of Latin Literature. By WALTER COVENTRY SUMMERS. London, Methuen & Co. 1920. pp. 316.

Quintilian: Institutes of Oratory. Translation by H. E. BUTLER. Vols. I and II, Loeb Classical Library. New York, Putnam. 1919.

In his translation and commentary, Professor Hubbell has given us new sources for our study of the ancient feud between philosophy and rhetoric. An excursus of about twenty pages presents an outline history of the quarrel. "The rise of teacher of oratory in Greece marks the beginning of a movement in Greek literature which is of highest importance in determining the course of Greek thought for the succeeding centuries; in fact through its influence on Rome and those modern literatures which derive from Rome it has shaped much of the thought and expression of the modern world. . . . The importance of the new teaching is shown by the violent opposition which it encountered."

The opposition to rhetorical teaching was presented as a matter of philosophical conviction. As in many educational disputes, however, it is well to examine the personal motives of the disputants. It is amazing to find so much argument expended upon the question whether or not rhetoric is an art. But upon the belief that public speaking was an art, rested the whole case for the teaching of rhet-

oric. Professor Hubbell presents as an analogy the modern argument over the doctrine of formal discipline in which ulterior motives are very influential. These motives were strengthened in the ancient argument by the fact that the higher studies of the youth were all guided by one teacher. If rhetoric were not an art, the rhetorician was out of a job. On the other hand, any victory of the rhetorician meant a corresponding loss to the professional philosophers. Beginning with Plato's attack upon rhetoric, the quarrel has never been more than temporarily quiescent. If modern teachers of public speaking are wise they will be guided in their educational battles by a thorough knowledge of this ancient debate.

Philodemus joined in the debate by attacking the rhetoricians from the Epicurean point of view. He discussed all the current arguments for and against rhetoric. He demolishes many of the objections to rhetoric only to show that the Epicurean objections are the true ones. His original contribution to the argument is his three-fold division of rhetoric. First is sophistic, which concerns matters of style in the composition of eulogistic orations. Here Philodemus admits an element of art. The second division, rhetoric proper, includes forensic and deliberative rhetoric. These branches are matters of practical experience, and teaching is useless. The third division is concerned with politics, and here again the claims of the rhetorician to produce political speakers by means of art are denounced. Rhetoric is ridiculed and philosophy exalted. The man who cannot speak in public is said to be more persuasive than the orator, for he is not distrusted. The life of the orator leads him into disputes of all sorts, while philosophy contents men with their own peaceful private lives. The philosophy which teaches men how to limit their desires is better than the rhetoric which helps to satisfy them.

The fragments of the papyri have been so mutilated that much can never be recovered. In many places not even intelligent conjectures can be made. In addition, the argument often is trivial and sophistical. Yet there is enough of value to repay careful attention. Other studies for which students of rhetoric are grateful to Professor Hubbell are *The Influence of Isocrates on Cicero, Dionysius, and Aristides,* and *Isocrates and the Epicureans.*

The teacher of public speaking who steals a bit of time for the study of classical rhetoric will find himself in an atmosphere

strangely familiar. He will remember that at the last meeting of the National Association of Teachers of Speech, Professor Blank was telling of an argument with his colleagues. Public speakers were nuisances, anyway. The philosophy department was especially hostile. Persuasion was pernicious. A philosopher who knew the truth had only to speak it. If people weren't saved thereby, they were a vulgar herd, anyway. Professor Blank had tried to use horse sense in his replies. Now it was clear he had failed. He should have used scholarship. If he had had the classic rhetoricians at his tongue's end he might have refuted the arguments and demonstrated his learning at the same time. His scholarship would have won the day, and held it, too, long after his arguments were forgotten.

The situation is curious. Here are learned philologists producing monographs on classical rhetoric. They publish them as theses and university studies with no expectation of their being read. The very subject is proof that here is scholarship for its own sake. A man who will produce this sort of thing is a true classicist; he is unspotted by the world. On the other hand we have growing up a new generation of teachers of public speaking. A certain practical necessity seemed to arise out of the death of literary and debating societies. Intercollegiate debaters were often hired as coaches and elementary drill masters. Some of them aspired to pursuits intellectual. They investigated subjects that seemed allied to their elementary work. But it was soon evident that there were about as many allied subjects as there were investigators. Quarrels arose as to which field contributed most. There was difficulty, too, in convincing the professor of history that a man who studied history to become an orator or a teacher of oratory could belong to the pure in heart. Teachers of public speaking found that they might travel through allied territory, but they could not possess it. These arguments among themselves, between themselves and their colleagues and their administrative officers involved exactly the questions discussed by Philodemus, by Cicero, by Isocrates, by Aristotle, by all classic writers upon rhetoric.

Now what would happen if our philologists should awake and find themselves famous? What if they were asked their opinion,

not about an emendation, but upon a practical application of an ancient theory so well expounded by themselves? What if their theses and monographs found a market? This might happen if teachers of public speaking realized the suggestiveness of the history of their own work. The fact that historians of rhetoric and teachers of rhetoric should live and move upon the same campus, entirely unconscious of each other's existence, emphasizes the need for a greater unity of learning.

For the student of rhetoric, Professor Petersson's book is the most useful biography of Cicero yet produced. The book aims, says Professor Petersson, "to present the Roman background, to determine and make clear the Roman attitude toward a man's work in the world, the political atmosphere of Rome, the spirit in which the orators spoke, and the Roman view of rhetoric, philosophy and authorship." While the bibliography given is excellent, it is one of the merits of the book that Professor Petersson has drawn chiefly from the works of Cicero himself, from the fifty-eight orations, the eight hundred letters and the two thousand pages of philosophy and rhetoric. The book does not give space to complaints about Cicero's political inconsistency or philosophical superficiality; nor, on the other hand, does it abound in rhetorical eulogy. It shows a sympathetic and intelligent understanding. A scholarly work, it is eminently readable.

Some of the chapters are of special interest to the student of rhetoric and oratory. Chapters five and six give an excellent account of the importance of oratory in Rome, and of Cicero's oratorical methods. The chapter on rhetoric is a comprehensive treatment of the rhetorical works of Cicero and their relation to the rhetorical theory and practice of the time. Professor Petersson has the ability to present a subject clearly, even when he has no enthusiasm for it. Of Rhetorical theory, as it is found in Cicero's earlier and more technical works, he says, "It is dry almost beyond alleviation; much of it is incredible as a means of creating actual oratory fit for the forum. It is a monstrously difficult theory, as involved as medieval theology." From an admirable statement of the formal theory Professor Petersson turns with enthusiasm to the later works, the De Oratore, Orator and Brutus. Of the De Oratore he says, "It is not easy to give a conception of the

infinite variety, the sanity, the charm, and the enthusiasm of this work." In the last pages of the biography is an account of the way in which ancient rhetoricians made free with the accounts of Cicero's death in order to form rhetorical exercises. It is very suggestive of the pernicious effect of rhetoric upon the ancient historians.

Professor Petersson has been criticised by one reviewer for devoting so much attention to rhetoric. But he gives it no more consideration than did Cicero himself. And if the general public finds other aspects of Cicero more interesting, students of rhetoric at least will be grateful to Professor Petersson for giving their subject something of the emphasis it received in Cicero's time.

"A second Cicero," was the title given to Fronto in the fourth century A. D., while some insisted that he was "not the second, but the alternative glory of Roman eloquence." In 1815 the discovery of a palimpsest containing portions of Fronto's correspondence raised great expectations. But the critics who read the letters said of Fronto that he was by turns" a querulous invalid and a teacher of empty rhetoric." In 1911 the Cambridge University Press published Dorothy Brock's *Studies in Fronto and His Age*. Here Fronto was presented in a more favorable light. But now we have the first English translation, and the general reader may use his own opinion while the scholars disagree.

However Fronto may be esteemed, the correspondence owes its interest in large measure to the intimate revelations of Marcus Aurelius. In his youth the Stoic Emperor studied rhetoric under Fronto, and his love for his teacher outlasted his interest in rhetoric. The whole struggle between philosophy and rhetoric is represented in the contest between Fronto and Rusticus for the attention of Marcus Aurelius. But it was hardly a contest here, for the emperor was a stoic by temperament, and it is not strange to find him saying, "I thank the gods that I did not make more proficiency in rhetoric, poetry and the other studies in which I should have been completely engaged if I had seen that I was making progress in them."

But even though it is as emporor and philosopher that we know Marcus Aurelius, the efforts of Fronto to make of him an orator and rhetorician are not without interest. The letters abound in the

most extravagant expressions of affection for each other. Bodily ailments and family affairs are discussed freely. Fronto can flatter gracefully and yet scold severely about an inelegant use of a word in an imperial edict. The exercises he sent to the youthful Marcus are typical of the rhetorical training of the time. The sophistic love of paradoxes is evident in his eulogies on smoke and dust, and on negligence. The elaborate figures which Marcus might use in complimenting his father show how the rhetorician used his "commonplaces." The letters generally termed *De Eloquentia* are written to impress upon Marcus the function of the emperor as an orator. Eloquence is sovereign. Philosophy may tell what to say, but rhetoric tells how to say it. And there are clever thrusts at the philosophers who affect to despise oratory. Fronto laughs at Plato's resonant periods denouncing eloquence. He points out strange objections of the logic-choppers to the technicalities of rhetoric. The pedagogical jealousies of the time were not markedly different from those of today, and this correspondence between an emperor and a rhetorician throws light upon the chief educational quarrel of the period.

The general literary characteristics of this age of decline are set forth by Professor Summers in his *Silver Age of Latin Literature*. The first chapter on the Declamations and the Pointed Style shows how the declamations of the rhetorical schools affected the literature of the period, and how the practice of composing them extended to prominent orators and men in high office, who declaimed at times in the presence of the emperor. As Pliny's Panegyric is the only extant speech of this period, the chapter on oratory is a collection of comments from classic writers on the orators of the day. To us these orators are merely speakers who led Tacitus to write his dialogue on the reasons for the decline of oratory. The chapter on grammar, criticism and rhetoric, offers a summary of Quintilian and a brief estimate of his work. The student of rhetoric will find the chief value of Professors Summer's book in the bibliographical material of the footnotes.

As critic of the literary tendencies of the silver age, as defender of the Ciceronian vigor, as sensible expounder of the technicalities of rhetoric, as critic of the philosophers, as authority on Roman educational ideals and methods, and finally as practical

teacher, Quintilian is one of the great figures in the field of rhetoric. A new translation of him is therefore of general interest. Professor Butler has completed two of the four volumes made necessary for the form of the Loeb Classical Library. Convenient volumes they are, too. Watson's translation in the Bohn library has for so long been the only one worth reading, that a comparison is inevitable. Watson has adhered more closely to the original both in selection of words and in sentence structure. While always unintelligible, his sentences have a Latin flavor. Professor Butler has shortened his sentences and modernized the idiom. If the English text only were in the hands of the reader, Watson would be somewhat preferable, perhaps, as savoring more of antiquity. And yet there is much to be said for modernized translations of this period. A reader of Lucian, for instance, will feel that the distance from now to then is not so great as that which separates us from the Victorian Age. Perhaps we comprehend Quintilian more truly if our translator makes him seem an author of today. At any rate, the defense is ready. The Latin is on the opposite page. The reader may translate for himself.

The biographical statement in Watson is fuller, the chapter headings and index are great aids to ready reference. But the convenient form, the very readable translation, and the possibility of constant comparison with the original will probably give preëminence to Professor Butler's work.

E. L. HUNT, Cornell University.

Models of Speech Composition. Compiled by JAMES MILTON O'NEILL. The Century Co., New York. 849 pp. A collection of ninety-five speeches under seventeen classifications, each speech complete. $3.50.

Here is the book of speeches that many of us have long been looking for; and now that we have found it we find our work in speech composition and style greatly benefited and lightened. It is really epoch-making in its field and of its kind; some time will elapse before anyone will be tempted to better it or to supplant it. Ninety-five speeches within two covers supplies a long-felt want and will be gratefully received everywhere.

The choice is good; a judicious sprinkling of the old and new.

Old favorites—no, necessities—like Burke on Conciliation, Erskine on The Defense of Lord Gordan, Webster's Knapp-White murder case, O'Connell's Repeal of the Union, Lincoln's Inaugurals, Blaine's Eulogy of Garfield, Grady's The New South, Wendell Phillips' The Scholar in a Republic—all are there. Of the other eighty-five some are as well-known as these, others less well-known, and many break into text-book prominence for the first time. Credit is due to the compiler for introducing us to some very excellent speeches of the past ten years; notably, President Wilson's war speeches, some of Roosevelt's, and two opening-shot speeches in recent political campaigns.

The classification into seventeen varieties will be helpful to most who use the book, but is of course as arbitrary as such classifications by occasions must be. A welcome class is that of Campaign Speeches, much neglected in previous books but important in education for American political life. The After-Dinner speeches are delightfully numerous and of high grade. The seventeen classes are grouped under the three larger classes, Forensic, Deliberative, and Demonstrative. It must be noted that Professor O'Neill evinces a welcome respect for college presidents and for addresses given to collegiate audiences. This is to report progress in a book of selections, especially if the book is to interest college men and women. Which, by the way, raises the pretty question, Has no woman ever written a speech worthy of place beside the ninety-five? Does this book mean to convey the impression that girls and women are shut out of the possibilities of masterly public address?

Two omissions have already struck the reviewer; not in the way of this or that speech he would like to see included; discussion of that is bootless because no one compilation could get in everything we all would like, there are more of the ones we want and need here than ever put into one book before; so on that point we have nothing but commendation. But why are we denied an index? To find a given speech in this book requires a search through the table of contents or else a committing of the table to memory. Lacking an index we would be helped greatly by page headings that show us at what we have opened the pages. Instead of repeating "Models of Speech Composition" on the left-hand page

over four hundred times, and the speech-maker's name on the right-hand page, we might better have had the title of the speech in sight at all times.

But these are minor matters in a book that so well fulfills its avowed purpose and so admirably meets a want that has been widespread and keen. The speeches are really models, and they are abundant for number and broadly catholic in range.

The mechanics of the book are excellent; clear type, good paper, a book that is not too bulky for the immense amount of material in it, and—a great virtue—it lies open in the hand or on the desk.

A book to solve several classroom problems: models of speech composition, examples of varieties of style, material for a course in the history of eloquence, and a wealth of material for studies of speech structure. C. H. W.

ARTICLES ON SPEECH IN CURRENT LITERATURE

COMPILED BY A. T. WEAVER
University of Wisconsin

ARCHIVES DE PSYCHOLOGIE

Bancels, Jean Larquier des—La Conservation des Images et Les Theories de la Memoire. Volume 15-16 (1915-16) Part 2, pp. 359-356.

Cellerier, Lucien—Des Reactions Organiques Accompagnant les Etats Psychologiques. Volume 17, 1919, pp. 257-296.

Claparede, Ed.— Exite-t-il — Des Images Verbo — Motrices. Volume 13-14 (1913-14), Part 1, pp. 93-103.

Claparede, Ed.—Tests de Developpement et Tests d'Aptitudes. Volume 13-14 (1913-14), Part 2, pp. 101-107.

Fromont, J. and Monod, O.—De Langage Articule Chez L'Homme Normal et Chez L'Aphasique. Volume 13-14 (1913-14), Part 1, pp. 120.

Lelesz, Helen—L'Orientation D'Esprit dans le Temoignage. Volume 13-14 (1913-14), Part 2, pp. 113-157.

Recherches sur la Correlation entre la memorie des Mots et la Memorie des Cuages. Volume 17 (1919), pp. 309-312.

ARCHIV FUER PAEDAGOGIK

Döring, Max—Neure Untersuchungen ueber die aesthetische Begabung des Schulkindes. December 1915, pp. 81-90 (second part).

Fischer, Aloys—Die Gesichtspunkte und Methoden der psychologischen Analyse der Schuelerindividualitaeten. November, 1914, (continued from previous volume) pp. 23-33.

Helbig-Fränkner, Helene—Aesthetische und rhythmische Gymnastik. (A review of different schools and methods and discussion of value of this form of physical exercise). Volume 1, pp. 432-434 (1913-14).

Huber, Karl—Der Lehrer als Erzaehler. January 1915, pp. 119-126.

Vogel, Cl.—Schallnachahmende Woerter. November 1914, pp. 25-27. Continued in January 1915, pp. 77-81.

BULLETIN BIBLIOGRAPHIQUE ET PEDAGOGIQUE

Plan du Discours—V. Volume 18-1914.

Gerard, V.—Quatre Discours Modernes—Analyse litterairie. Volume 18, 1914, p. 47. Continued on page 101. (Begun in Volume 17, 1913, p. 410).

THE DRAMA

Clarndon, Ross—The "Happy Ending." Volume 11, 4, pp. 123-25. (Library 1921).

Huickley, S. B.—Drama and the English Course. Volume 8, No. 31, August 1918, pp. 417-35.

Lewis, Prof. B. R.—One Hundred One-Act Plays. Volume 11, No. 5, pp. 258-59—April 1921.

McGlynn, Frank—What is Acting? Volume 11, No. 5, pp. 145-46.

Willett, Grace W.—Original Plays for Better Speech Week. Volume 11, No. 1, pp. 17.

Zilboorg, G.—A Course in Russian Drama. Volume 11, No. 2, pp. 66.

Zilboorg, G.—Theatre Soliloquies. Volume 11, No. 6, pp. 225-26, 56-7.

Community Theatre. Volume 11, No. 3, pp. 90-3

(Editorial)—The Community Theatre of Syracuse. Volume 11, No. 6, pp. 242.

(Editorial)—Dramatics in Boston Settlements. Volume 11, No. 6, pp. 243.

EDUCATION

Andrews, Hazel M.—Vocational and Moral Guidance through Dramatics. Volume XLI, No. 2 (October 1920), pp. 123-31.

Brown, H. A.—Significance of the Measurement of Ability to Read. Volume XXXVI, No. 9 (May 1919) pp. 589-610.

Colvin, S. S.—Purposes and Methods of Psychological Tests in Schools and Colleges. Volume XL, No. 7 (March 1920), pp. 404-16.

Crumly, C. W.—The Movies—Bane or Blessing. Volume XL, No. 4 (December 1919) pp. 199-216.

Dodge, R.—Educational Significance of the Army Intelligence Tests. Volume XL, No. 7 (May 1920) pp. 417-28.

Henderson, Gertrude M.—Educating the Child's Imagination. Volume XLI, (January 1921) No. 5, pp. 303-11.

Hyspenstell, H. S.—Transtitional Reading. Volume XXXVI, No. 8 (April 1916), pp. 483-92.

Jenkins, F. W.—A Comprehensive Plan for Tabulating and Interpreting Educational Statistics. Volume XLI, No. 2 (October 1920), pp. 119-22.

McCain, Rea—The Future of the Class Play. Vol. XXXVI, No. 8 (April 1916), pp. 224-31.

Moore, W. C.—Silent Reading. Volume XL, No. 1 (September 1919), pp. 9-14.

Palmer, F. H.—Some of the Movies. Volume XLI, No. 7 (March 1921), pp. 468-9.

Savrenson, Prof. L. S.—The Teaching of Oral English. Vol. XXXVIII, No. 7 (March 1918), pp. 936-40.

Steeper, H. T.—Extra Curriculum Activities in the High School. Volume XXXIX, No. 6. (February 1919), pp. 367-73.

Sutton, A. S.—Outline Study of Cicero's First Latitunian Oration. Volume XXXVII, No. 1 (September 1916) pp. 29-34.

Sutton, A. S.—Outline Study of Cicero's Defense of the Proposed Manilian Law. Volume XXXVII, No. 2 (November 1916) pp. 184-5.

Sutton, A. S.—Outline of Cicero's Orations. Volume XXXVI, No 2 (October 1915), pp. 92-4.

Sutton, A. S.—Outline of Cicero's First Latitunian Oration. Volume XXXVI, No. 4 (December 1915), pp. 231-3.

Tompkins—Stammering—And Consistency. Volume XXXVI, No. 6 (February 1916) pp. 286-88.

Towne, C. F.—Relative Importance of Oral and Silent Reading. Volume XXXVI, No. 9 (May 1919), pp. 571-4.

Wells, G. F.—Reading as a School Subject. Vol. XXXVI, No. 9 (May 1919), pp. 585-8.

EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION

Johnston, C. H.—Educating the Emotions. Volume 3, No. 1 (January 1917), pp. 46-7.

Newton, J. H.—A Stronger Foundation for English. Volume 3, No. 8 (October 1917), pp. 459-68.

Rafter, A. L.—Sight Saving and Speech Improvement Classes. Volume 4, No. 9 (November 1918), pp. 493-98.

Wasson, A. W.—Silent Reading Test. Volume 3, No. 2 (February 1917) pp. 98-101.

EDUCATIONAL NEWS BULLETIN

(U. S. Bureau of Education, Bulletins 1915-21)

Charmley, Constance—Some Observations on the Conditions and Treatment of Stuttering. Bulletin 1915, No. 4, pp. 90-94.

Maken, G. Hudson, M. D.—A Study of 1000 Cases of Stammering. Bulletin 1915, No. 4, pp. 95-98.

Commencement "Oratory" (Revised). Vol. 7, No. 3 (March 29, 1915) p. 1.

EDUCATIONAL REVIEW

Beyer, T. P.—The Vocabulary of Two Years. Volume 49, February, 1915, pp. 191-203.

Fillers, H. D.—Oral and Written Errors in Grammar. Volume 54, December 1917, pp. 458-70.

Ketchans, V.—Public Speaking Courses in State Universities. Volume 53, February, 1917, pp. 151-60.

Koch, Katrina—The Development of a Vocabulary in the Adolescent. Volume 49, January 1915, pp. 68-73.

Krause, C. A.—Systematic Vocabulary Building. Vol. 49, (March 1915), pp. 313-14.

Mead, Arthur R.—Tendencies in Educational Measurements. Vol. 61, No. 2, (February 1921), pp. 117-27.

Perkins, A. S.—Measurements of Effect of Latin on English Vocabulary. Volume 52 (December 1916), pp. 501-06.

Rogers, Agnes L.—Intelligence Tests and Educational Progress. Volume 61, No. 2 (February 1921), pp. 110-16.

Wilson, Z. P.—Oral Composition and the Foreign Student. Volume 56, June 1918, pp. 72-4.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL JOURNAL

Anderson and Merton—Remedial Work in Reading. Part 1—Vol. 16, pp. 685-701. Part II, Vol. 16, pp. 772-791.

Currier and Duquid—Phonics or No Phonics. Volume 16, pp. 286-287.

Sears and Diebel—Common Mistakes in Pupil's Oral English. Vol. 16, pp. 44-54.

THE ENGLISH JOURNAL

Chicago Speech Conference (Woman's Club). Vol. IX, June 1920, pp. 357-59.

Johnson—Problems in Present Conduct of Declamatory Contests. Vol. IX, March 1920, pp. 156-67.

Paul—A Report on Better Speech Week. April 1920 (Vol. IX), pp. 194-200.

Rodkey—Oral English as a Means of Socialization. Vol. IX, October 1920, pp. 400-447.

Skinner—Socializing Dramatics. Vol. IX, October 1920, pp. 448-456.

Tompkins—An Experiment with Home-Made Plays. Vol. IX, December 1920, pp. 591-593.

Tompkins—The Play Course in High School. Vol. IX, November 1920, pp. 530-533.

HIGH SCHOOL QUARTERLY

Allen—Oral English Practically Applied in High Schools. Vol. V, June 1917, pp. 94-104.

Editorial—District Contests. Vol. VII, January 1919, pp. 62-63.

Maphis—Debate of Literary and Athletic League in Virginia. Vol. VI, October 1917, pp. 24.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF AMERICAN LINGUISTICS

Frachtenberg—Abnormal Types of Speech in Quilente. Vol. I, No. 4, December 1920.

Michelson—Two Phonetic Shifts Occurring in Many Algonquian Languages. Vol. I, No. 4, December 1920.

JOURNAL OF ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY

Blanton—An Unusual Case of Speech Inhibition. Vol. XI, pp. 325-327.

Blanton and Blanton—What is Problem of Stuttering. Vol. XIII, pp. 303-313.

Dunlap—The Stuttering Boy. Vol. XI, pp. 44-48.

Fletcher—The Mental Imagery of Stutters. Vol. XI, pp. 34-43.

Sidis—Psychopathic Aphonia, Stammering and Catalepsy. Vol. XII, pp. 100-113.

Solomon—Review: "An Experimental Study of Stuttering." Vol. X, pp. 142-43.

Solomon—"Stammering as a Psychoneurosis"—A Criticism. Vol. X, pp. 120-137.

JOURNAL OF APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY

Wallin—Theories of Stuttering. Vol. 1, pp. 349-367.

JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

Buswell, G. T.—The Relationship Between Eye-Perception and Voice-Response in Reading. Vol. XII, No. 4, April 1921, pp. 217-227.

JOURNAL OF NERVOUS AND MENTAL DISEASES

McDonald, Jr. William—Mental Disease and Language. Vol. 42, July 1915, pp. 482-491. Vol. 42, August 1915, pp. 540-563.

Scripture and Glogan—Speech Conflict. Vol. 43, February 1916, pp. 139-149.

JOURNAL OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION

Baker, George P.—The Teaching of Argumentative Discourse in the High Schools 1903, pp. 460-66.

Brown, Moses True—The Delsarte Philosophy of Expression. 1882, pp. 55-62.

Bullowa, Alma M.—The Need of Speech Work in the High Schools. 1916, pp. 870-73.

Courtenay, Mary E.—An Attempt to Make Oral Composition Effective. 1912, pp. 721-725.

Dunton, Larkin—Oral Construction. 1882, pp. 63-76.

Fosdick, Frank Sheldon—The Relation and the Possibilities of High School Training in Relation to Public Speaking. 1894, pp. 773-781.

Frink, H. A.—Rhetoric and Public Speaking in the American College. 1892, pp. 383-393.

Gault, F. B.—The Synthetic Sound System of Teaching Reading. 1891, pp. 572-581.

Greene, James S.—The Mission of the Speech Specialist. 1916, pp. 864-867.

Hartwell, Charles S.—The Teaching of Argumentative Discourse in the High Schools. 1903, pp. 446-470.
Howard, John—Phychology and Hygiene of the Vocal Organs. 1893, pp. 514-518.
Lyon, Miss—Speech Improvement in the Chicago Public Schools. 1916, pp. 869-70.
McDonald, Dennis J.—Speech Improvement. 1916, pp. 862-864.
McTuliffe, George B.—Tone and Hearing. 1916, 869-69.
Mitchell, Vethoke E.—Oral Deformities in their Relation to Defective Speech. 1916, p. 874.
Poulson, Edna Snell—The Aims of the Delsartean Disciples. 1888. pp. 667-70.
Reed, Mrs. Frank A.—Speech Work in the Detroit Public Schools. 1916, 869-70.
Reigart, John F.—Speech Correction as a School Problem. 1916, pp. 873-874.
Richards, Zalmon—Voice Culture in Primary and Elementary Schools. 1891, pp. 606-614.
Sheldon, Eleanor—Oral Themes. 1912, pp. 718-721.
Suzzallo, Davis, Blaisdell—Potent Factors in Oral Reading and Oral Language. 1907, pp. 478-497.
Thorpe, Mrs. E. J. Ellery—What Teachers Need to Know About Speech Impediments. 1902, pp. 1031-1036.
Trueblood, Thomas C.—Educational Value of Training in Public Speaking. 1902, pp. 133-144.
Wile, Ira S.—The Economic Value of Speech Correction. 1916, pp. 875-876.

LANCET

Dupuy, Eugene—Localization in Regard to Loss of Speech. Vol. 92, p. 209 (July 25, 1914).
Mitter, R. K.—Cut Throat in Relation to Speech. Vol. 87, p. 1501 (May 1909).
Scripture, E. W.—The Pathology of Speech. Vol. 94, p. 943. (December 2, 1916).
Loss of Speech and Shell Shock. Vol. 94, p. 212 (Jan. 22, 1916).
Speech in Cases of Cut Throat. Vol. 88, p. 1294 (Oct. 29, 1910).
Speech Without Larynx. Vol. 91, p. 94 (July 12, 1913).
The Relation of Speech to Intonation and Rythm. Vol. 92, p. 764 (March 14, 1914).

LARYNGOSCOPE

Cadawallader, Bernard—Elimination of Speech and Voice Defects. Vol. 24, pp. 986-992 (1914).
Crouter, A. S, E.—Development of Speech in the Deaf Child. Vol. 20, pp. 642-652 (1910).

Blogan, Otto—Concerning the Articulo-Respiratory Disturbances of Speech. Vol. 26, pp. 869-895 (May 1916).
Keyes, Thomas B.—Hypnotism in the Cure of Stammering. Vol. 1 and 2, p. 243 (October 1896).
Maknen, Dr. G. Hudson—Exhibition of a Case of Stammering. Vol. 7 and 8, p. 39 (July 1899).
Kaknen, Dr. G. Hudson—On the Relation of the Faculty of Hearing to the Faculty of Speech. Vol. 19, 1-3 (January 1909).
Kaknen, Dr. G. Hudson—Some Obstructions to Speech Development. Vol. 21, pp. 993-1001 (1911).
McCowen, Mary—Development of Speech Reading in the Deaf Child. Vol. 20, 642-652 (1910)
Scripture, Glogan, DeBra—Left Handedness as an Etiological Factor in Speech Defects. Vol. 27, pp. 157-169 (1917).
Scripture, Mary K.—Speech Defects. Vol. 28, pp. 12, 78, 735, 817, year 1918.
Scripture, Mary K.—Negligent Speech. Vol. 29, pp. 31-41 (1919).
Steel, Mary S.—Plea for the Early Training of Defective Speech. Vol. 29, pp. 160-162 (1919).
Tompkins, E.—Stammering—a Responsibility. Vol. 27, pp. 637-642. (August 1917).
(Review)—The Relation Between the Voice and the Structure of the Vocal Organs. Vol. 12, p. 801 (1902).

MENTAL HYGIENE

White, W. A.—The Behavioristic Attitude. January 1921, p. 1.

MIND

Baillie, J. B.—On Nature of Memory Knowledge. Vol. 26, 1917. p. 249.
Demos, R.—Discussion of Certain Type of Negative Proposition. Vol. 26, 1917, p. 188.
Fawcett, E. D.—"Activity;" a Vital Problem. Vol. 27, 1918, p. 92.
Fawcett, E. D.—The World as Imagination. Vol. 26, 1917. p. 357.
Laird, J.—Recollection, Association, and Memory. p. 407, Vol. 26, 1917.
Rushdall, Hastings—Is Conscience an Emotion? p. 412, Vol. 24, 1915.
Shand, A. F.—Foundations of Character, being a Study of the Tendencies of the Emotions and Sentiments. Vol. 24, 1915, p. 569.
Stocks, J. L.—Test of Experience. Vol. 27, 1918, p. 79.
Sturt, H.—Principles of Understanding. p. 265, Vol. 26, 1917.
Thornburn, W. M.—What is a Person? Vol. 26, 1917. p. 291.

THE OHIO EDUCATIONAL MONTHLY

Alan, John—Course of Study in Modern High School. p. 295, Vol. 66, 1917.

Bryant—Silent Reading. p. 109, Vol. 67, 1918.
Cherrington, Homer—Shakespeare in the High School. p. 310, Vol. 65, 1916.
Clifton, J. L.—Teacher's Reading. p. 527, Vol. 66, 1917.
Corson—Response to the Address of Welcome. p. 133, Vol. 66, 1917.
Flannery—Oral Reading. p. 134, Vol. 67, 1918.
Layton, S. H.—Individual Differences. p. 10, January, 1921.
Lemert—Better Speech Movement. p. 136, Vol. 67, 1918.
Link, Josephine—Expression in Reading, p. 97, Vol. 67, 1916.
Scripture—Speech Defects and Some Methods for their Treatment. p. 490, Vol. 67, 1918.
Smith, Sadie—Reading. p. 293, Vol. 65, 1916.
Fifteen Speech Teachers. p. 420, Vol. 68, 1919.
New Ways of Teaching Children to Read. p. 406, Vol. 68, 1919.
Self-Consciousness. p. 108, Vol. 70, No. 4.
Standards for Judging a Recitation. p. 103, Vol. 67, 1918.

PEDAGOGICAL SEMINARY

Barrows, Sarah L.—Experimental Phonetics as an Aid to the Study of Language. p. 63-75, Vol. 23, 1916.
Bohn, William E.—First Steps in Verbal Expression. p. 578-595, Vol. 21, 1914.
Boyd, William—Development of a Child's Vocabulary. p. 955-124, Vol. 21, 1914.
Bush, Arthur Dermont—Vocabulary of a Three Year Old Girl. Pp. 124-142, Vol. 21, 1914.
Grupe, Mary A.—Phonics in Relation to Early Reading. Pp. 175-183, Vol. 23, 1916.
Hinckley, Alice C.—A Case of Retarded Speech Development. Pp. 121-146, Vol. 23, 1916.
Littwin, Maxwell F.—Literature Memorization in the Light of Experimental Pedagogy. Pp. 502-527, Vol. 23, 1916.
Nice, Margaret Morse—Development of a Child's Vocabulary in Relation to Environment. Pp. 35-64, Vol. 22, 1915.
Otis, Arthur S.—Considerations Concerning the Making of a Scale for the Measurement of Reading Ability. Pp. 528-49, Vol. 23, 1916.
Tompkins, Ernest—The Pedagogue and the Stammering Child. Pp. 127-28, Vol. 23, 1916.
Stammering and Its Extirpation. Pp. 153-174, Vol. 23, 1916.

PSYCHOANALYTIC REVIEW

Eder, E. D.—Stuttering. Vol. II, 1915.
Speeber, H.—The Influence of Sexual Factors on the Origin and Development of Language. Vol. II, 1915.
Weeviss, K.—Rhyme and Refrain: A Contribution to the Psychogenesis of the Poetic Means of Expression. Vol. VI, 1919.

PSYCHOLOGICAL BULLETIN

Bingham, W. V.—Vocal Functions. Vol. XII, 1915.
Brown, W.—Memory. Vol. XV, 1918.
Brown, W.—Language. Vol. VII, 1910.
Burrow, T.—Ingregniersos's Musical Language. Vol. V, 1908.
Cameron, E. H.—Reading. Vol. XVI, 1919.
Dodge, A.—Reading. Vol. II, 1905.
Faris, E.—The Psychology of Language. Vol. XVI, 1919.
Keiby, G. H.—Speech and Thought. Vol. V, 1908.
Ogden, R. M.—Hearing. Vol. XVI, 1919.
Ogden, R. M.—Imageless Thought. Vol. VIII, 1911.
Renediger, W. C.—Memory and Thought. Vol. XVI, 1919.
Sheldon, W. H.—Speech (Van Gummchem). Vol. V, 1908.
Shephard, J. F.—Laughter. Vol. V, 1908.
Smith, W.—Comedy and the Comic Experience. Vol. VIII, 1910.
Wallin, J. E. W.—Auditory Discununciation. Vol. II, 1905.

PSYCHOLOGICAL CLINIC

Holsopple, F. G.—A Case of Infantile Stammer Resulting in Apparent Imbecility. Vol. XII, 1918-19.
Huckley, A. C.—A Speech Defect Case Treated at Columbia University. Vol. V, 1911-12.
Ide, G. G.—Spoken Language an Essential Tool. Vol XIII, May 15, 1920.
Morrison, C. E.—Speech Defects in Young Children. Vol. VIII, 1914-15.
Nice, M. N.—Speech of a Left-Handed Child. Vol. IX, 1915-16.
Swift, W. B.—Speech Defects in School Children and How to Treat them. Vol. XII, 1918-19.
Town, C. H.—Training of a Case of Infantile Stammer. Vol. IV, 1910-11.
Town, C. H.—Infantile Stammer (Baby Talk) in a Boy of 12 Years. Vol. I, 1907-08.
Town, C. H.—Language Development in Idiots and Imbeciles. Vol. VI, 1912-13.

PSYCHOLOGICAL REVIEW

Givler, R. C.—The Psycho-physiological Effects of the Elements of Speech in Relation to Poetry. Vol. XIX, Nov. 30, 1915.

REVUE PSYCHOLOGIQUE

Arbranowski, Edward—Les Illusions de la Memoire. Pp. 192-221, Vol. 2, 1909.
Braunshausen, Dr. N.—Methodes et Resultats de L'etude Experimentale de la Memoire. Pp. 22-38, Vol 4, 1911.
Ioteyko, Mlle le Dr. I.—Comment on Retient les Chiffres, les Syllables, les Mots, les Images. Pp. 3-20, Vol. 4, 1911.

TEACHERS COLLEGE RECORD

Crawford, Caroline—Teaching of Dramatic Arts in the Kindergarten and Elementary School. Pp. 366-383, Vol. 16, Sept., 1915.

(Editor)—School Production of Shakespeare Plays. Pp. 174-76, Vol. 17, March, 1916.

Lodge, Gonzales—Dramatic Interpretation in the Teaching of the Classics. Pp. 217-338, Vol. 21, May, 1921.

Thorndike, E. L.—The Measurement of Ability in Reading: Preliminary Scales and Tests. Pp. 1-67, Vol. 15, September, 1914.

Thorndike, E. L.—Measurement in Achievement in Reading: Word Knowledge. Pp. 430-435, Vol. 17, November, 1917.

Warner, La Mont A.—Some Fine Art Problems in Pageant Making. Pp. 245-47, Vol. 16, May, 1915.

The Shakespeare Festival of Teachers College. Costumes by Ruth Wilmot. Decorations by Wm. F. Collins, Festival hats by Evelyn S. Tobby. Organization by Allen Abbott. Pp. 142-46, Vol. 17, March, 1916.

THEATRE ARTS MAGAZINE

Allen, Elizabeth S.—Eurythmics for the Theatre. Pp. 42-46, Vol. 3, January, 1919.

Armfield, Maxwell—Color and Light. Pp. 127-130, Vol. 3, April, 1919.

Bymer, William Gilmore—The Hollywood Community Theatre. Pp. 172-78, Vol. 3, July, 1919.

Bishop, John Peale—The Youngest Among the Moderns: James Reynolds as an Artist in Settings and Costumes. Pp. 75-79, Vol. 5, January, 1921.

Bragdon, Claude—Artificial Lighting for Out-of-Doors. Pp. 189-192, Vol. 1, August, 1917.

Cheney, Sheldon—Sam Hume's Adaptable Settings. Pp. 119-127, Vol 1, May, 1917.

Cheney, Sheldon—The Most Important Thing in the Theatre. Pp. 167-171, Vol. 1, August, 1917.

Cheney, Sheldon—Play with Light. Pp. 195, Vol. 1, August, 1917.

Eaton, Walter Prichard—Playwrights and Professors. Pp. 16-20, Vol. 4, January, 1920.

Eaton, Walter Prichard—Acting and the New Stagecraft. Pp. 9-12, Vol. 1, November, 1916.

Ford, Clyde R.—The Little Theatre and the Small Town. Pp. 144-148, (Summer No.) Vol. 2, 1918.

Head, Cloyd, and Gavin, Mary—Unity of Production. Pp. 60-68, Vol. 5, January, 1921.

Hopkins, Arthur—Our Unreasonable Theatre. Pp. 79-84, Vol .2, February, 1918.

Hopkins, Arthur—Moonshine. Pp. 51-62, Vol. 3, January, 1919.
MacGowan, Kenneth—The Path of the New Theatre. Pp. 84-90, Vol. 3, April, 1919.
Moderwell, Hiram Kelly—The Art of Robert Edmund Jones. Pp. 51-60, Vol. 1, February, 1917.
Mowbray, Mary—The Workman Instinct in the Theatre. Pp. 172-78, Vol. 3, July, 1919.
Mumford, Claire Dana—A New Master and the Audience. Pp. 67-74, Vol. 2, February, 1918.
Oppenheim, James—A Note on Poetic Drama. Pp. 91-93, Vol. 2, February, 1918.
Peters, Rollo—The Newest Art. Pp. 119-130, Vol. 2, Summer Number, 1918.
Pichel, Irving—Stage Machinery and Lighting Equipment for Small Theatres and Community Buildings. Pp. 137-152, Vol. 4, April, 1920.
Pichel, Irving—Scene and Action. Pp. 119-20, Vol. 3, April, 1919.
Pichel, Irving—Stage Construction for Small Theatres and Community Buildings. Pp. 25-40, Vol. 4, January, 1920.
Rosse, Hermann—Artificiality and Reality in the Future Theatre. Pp. 95-97, Vol. 3, April, 1919.
Sayler, Oliver—Theory and Practice in Russion Theatres. Pp. 200-214, Vol. 4, July, 1920.
Seveen, Margaret—The Use of Masks in Dancing. Pp. 274-97, Vol. 4, October, 1920.
Simonson, Lee—The Necessary Illusion. Pp. 91-92, Vol 3, April, 1919.
Simonson, Lee—The Painter and the Stage. Pp. 3-12, Vol. 2, December, 1917.
Sayler, Oliver M.—The Moscow Art Theatre. Pp. 290-315, Vol. 4, October, 1920.
Smedley, Constance—The Greenleaf Theatre. Pp. 94-100, Vol. 2, February, 1918.
Sowers, W. L.—An Experiment in Simplicity. Pp. 81-84, Vol. 1, February, 1917.
Tucker Marion—The Plays of St. John Hankin. Pp. 78-80, Vol. 3, April, 1919.
Wenger, John—The Mission of the State Setting. Pp. 93-94, Vol. 3, April, 1919.

WISCONSIN JOURNAL OF EDUCATION

Green, Ethel M.—Language Work in Dramatization—Second Grade. Pp. 67-70, Vol. 50, February, 1918.
O'Shea, M. V.—Oral Expression. P. 123, Vol. 50, February, 1918.

ZEITSCHRIFT FUER ANGEWANDTE PSYCHOLOGIE

Eng, Dr. Helga—Abstrakte Begriffe im Sprechen und Denken. Beihefte 8-12, 1914-15, Part I, pp. 1-116.

Giese, Fritz—Das freie literarische Schaffen bei Kindern und Jugendlichen. Beihefte 5-7, 1913, Part VII, pp. 1-242.

Habrich, Johannes—Ueber die Entwicklung der Abstraktionsfaehigkeit von Sehuelerinnen. Vol. 9, 1915, pp. 189-243.

Rupp, Hans—Ueber die Pruefung musikalischer Faehigkeiten. Vol. 9, 1915, pp. 1-75.